

80th Year
Vol. 160

THE

Quarterly
No. 321

DUBLIN REVIEW

APRIL, 1917

MAY 9 1917

UNIV. OF MICH.
LIBRARY

BURNS & OATES
28 Orchard Street London W.
B. HERDER, 17 South Broadway, St. Louis, Mo.

Price 3s 6d Net. Yearly Subscription 12s Post Free.

The
**CATHOLIC
WHO'S WHO
AND YEAR BOOK :: 1917**

Edited by SIR F. C. BURNAND. Crown
8vo. Cloth. 3s. 6d. net (postage: Inland,
5d.; Foreign, 8d.).

THE "CATHOLIC WHO'S WHO" is a book of reference and a book to read. It has been made personally interesting page by page. It furnishes Biographies (with addresses) of over 4,000 Catholics in the United Kingdom and the Colonies distinguished by their abilities, their character, their rank, or even their riches. Its practical utility in identifying Catholic officers of the Army and Navy, and outlining their careers, is particularly manifest at the present time. The 1917 issue contains new naval and military entries and a Roll of Honour of Catholic officers fallen in the war, and those decorated for exceptional service.

BURNS & OATES LIMITED
28 Orchard Street, London, W. 1.





MY MEMORIES

I HAVE been asked to write my recollections for the DUBLIN REVIEW, and the only reason I can imagine for such a request is that I have lived a longer time than almost any man now in public life.

It must be very difficult for the present generation to reconstruct for themselves the world into which I was born, things are so completely changed. The Napoleonic Wars were still a living memory. Many people who were by no means old when I was a boy had seen General Washington; and, when I was ten years old, men who were as old then as I am now were fourteen years of age at the time of the Declaration of Independence. Slavery was in existence in the Southern States, and was to remain in existence until I was a grown man and a priest. Machinery was just coming into use, but nobody dreamed of the extent to which it would be employed later on. Electricity in all its uses was almost undreamed of. Men knew from the experiments of Benjamin Franklin that it might possibly be used, but the telegraph, telephone, and electric light had still to come. Railroads were a new invention. The Catholic Church, both in England and in this country, was a small and very depressed body. I was eleven years old when Newman became a Catholic. Those two great Movements which were to spread Catholicism so marvelously throughout the English-speaking world—I mean the exodus of the Irish people after the Famine, and the entrance of a large body of Anglicans into the Catholic Church—were still to come. In short, one may say that when I was a young man we were still living on the legacy of the eighteenth century.

The first really great man whom I can remember to have known intimately was the venerable and learned Archbishop of Baltimore, Dr. Francis Patrick Kenrick, who ordained me to the holy priesthood. He was the first great intellectual light of the American Church, and his *Moral Theology* remains to this day a monument of

My Memories

his erudition, although to my mind his greatest work has not yet received the full recognition which it deserves. I mean his version of the Sacred Scriptures; for to his translation of the sacred volume he brought the ripest learning of his age, combining the correctness of the Douay with the beautiful English style of the King James version. It is a pity that his translation is not better known among Catholics, especially here in America, where it was made our American Authorized Version by the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore. I do not think I exaggerate when I say that Dr. Kenrick was probably the most learned man of his time in the United States. But he was not only a very learned, he was a very holy man as well, and of the greatest simplicity of character. When he was appointed Archbishop of Baltimore and translated from Philadelphia, he arrived in Baltimore in a most characteristic fashion. I have often heard our old sacristan at the Cathedral tell how he went into the sacristy one morning at five o'clock and found a strange Bishop waiting to say Mass, who proved to be the new occupant of the Archiepiscopal See. He had come very quietly during the early hours of the morning; and, after his Mass at the Cathedral, in the same quiet and unostentatious way he entered his Episcopal residence and took up the duties of the principal diocese of America. It was marvellous how he combined study and writing with his duties as Archbishop. As I sit in my study, which was also his, I can call him vividly before me as he sat at his desk working busily over his translation of Holy Scripture, or over his *Moral Theology*; but ever ready to put down his pen to answer a knock at the door and to receive a visitor. Now it would be some important ecclesiastic, but just as frequently some little child of the parish who had come in to spend a few moments with one who was noted for his great love of little children. His door was ever open to visitors, and all classes of the community sought advice and comfort from him. He was of such simplicity of character that he could never refuse to anybody in trouble whatever financial aid was in his power. In fact so great was his beneficence that

My Memories

he was constantly in a state of absolute poverty, having given away everything he possessed.

He could never have accomplished what he did if he had not lived in most profound recollection. When it was time to go off on a visitation he would lay down his pen, go out and get into the carriage, often take a hard and difficult journey, and, returning, he would come to his desk and take up his work exactly where he left off. He was heart and soul for the preservation of the Union; and there can be no doubt that what seemed to be the breaking-up of the Union in 1861 very much hastened his death. I can very well remember a painful experience which the Archbishop went through during the first year of the war. We have a prayer in America composed by Archbishop Carroll for all estates of men in the Church of God, and it was the Archbishop's custom to have this prayer read publicly before Mass, in the vernacular, especially in the Cathedral Church, where, by the way, it is still read every Sunday. In this prayer there is a petition that the Union of the American people may be preserved; and, when the Southern States began to secede, so high did secession sentiment run in Baltimore that some of the clergy begged him to omit the prayer in which the objectionable petition found its place. At last, when all the clergy of the Cathedral had begged to be excused, the Archbishop determined to read it himself, and I suppose during the reading of that prayer he suffered more than one could well imagine; for, when he mentioned the Union of the States, many people got up and publicly left the Cathedral, and those who remained expressed their dissent from the Archbishop's petition by a great rustling of papers and silks.

It was from His Grace that I imbibed a strong attachment to the Union. I had been born a Southerner and brought up a Southerner, and my heart was, of course, with the Southern States. Indeed, my brother was actually fighting in the Army of the Confederacy; but I could never believe that secession would succeed, and

My Memories

even if it should succeed I could not help but see that it would be the destruction of what was already a growing, and what might become a very great, nation. Therefore my head was always with the Union. But the Union authorities were not always as considerate as they might have been in their treatment of those States which did not actually go out, but in which the secession sentiment was very strong. Baltimore was put under martial law, which was very strictly enforced; and this created a great deal of secession sentiment which did not exist before; and men like myself, who was then a priest and known to be of Union sympathies, were often treated rudely and harshly by the military authorities. I was myself at that time military chaplain at Fort McHenry, and I remember that on one occasion, after having heard the confession of a Southern prisoner, I tried to get him some much-needed nourishment which had not been provided for him by the doctor of the hospital; and for this act, by which I tried merely to help a suffering fellow-creature, irrespective of his politics, I was told that my services would no longer be acceptable at the fortress, and that I need not return. However, I did return, since I threatened to make known to the higher authorities what had taken place; and men who exercise martial law with little regard for the feelings of those below them are often very sensitive as to the feelings of those above them.

I sincerely hope that my countrymen may never again live through a period like that between 1860 and 1865, when the very foundations of our national existence seemed to be breaking up, and there were times when chaos seemed to stare us in the face. All war is terrible, but civil war is detestable, for it not only puts man against man, but it puts brother against brother, and children often against their own father. But if the Civil War was terrible, the after effects in the South were deplorable. The party in power after the war acted toward the South with what I can only describe as abominable perfidy. The war had been carried on by the Union on the

My Memories

supposition that the Southern States, being an integral part of the Union, could not leave it, and the Union Armies declared themselves to be fighting merely to maintain the Southern States in their former relations with the Federal Government. But after the war they treated the South as though it were a conquered country, and deprived the States of the inalienable right to local self-government. I can only attribute this to the death of that great and good man, Abraham Lincoln, who so thoroughly understood the temperament of the American people, and whose earnest desire was to do justice and to extend mercy. His murder was the greatest misfortune which ever came upon the South. It was, as many people may remember, on a Good Friday night ; and it was an extraordinary coincidence that at the very time of the murder I was preaching a sermon in one of the churches of Baltimore, on the ingratitude shown in the action of the Jews, and especially of Judas, toward Our Divine Lord. "Imagine," said I, "a great and good ruler, who had done everything to deserve the confidence and affection of his subjects, who had lived only for his country and had had no desire but for his country's good, imagine such a ruler struck down by the hand of an assassin ! Would you not feel, my brethren, a deep indignation at his murder ?"

Shortly after the Civil War I was made Vicar-Apostolic of North Carolina, where I had a chance to see all the horrors of reconstruction at their worst. I shall never forget my introduction to my Vicariate. The night I arrived in Wilmington, there was a torch-light procession of the emancipated slaves, many of them now holding office and domineering over their former masters. If one can imagine an enormous crowd of negroes, most of whom were intoxicated, all of whom were waving torches in the blackness of the night, one can very easily imagine the first impressions of a new and very young Bishop.

The next great event in which I had any part was the Vatican Council, of which I was the youngest Bishop, and

My Memories

of which I am now the only Father surviving. As it is very hard for Americans of these days to understand the bitterness which preceded our Civil War, so it is very hard for Catholics to realize the bitterness of controversy which existed before the Vatican Council. The controversy consisted not so much as to whether or not the Pope was or was not infallible. All of us had been brought up in the doctrine that he was the centre of unity; that communion with him was communion with the Catholic Church; that severance from him meant severance from the Visible Church of God, and therefore his infallibility seemed to be an inevitable conclusion. The controversy raged for the more part about the expediency of the definition. There was a large number of Bishops who thought it inexpedient to define the Infallibility of the Roman Pontiff at the time when the Church was not on the best of terms with many States of Europe; even with Catholic States. They feared to exasperate the Governments of Europe and to throw back possible conversions. As a matter of fact neither of these things has taken place. The definition of Papal Infallibility did more to rescue the Church from the dominion of the State than anything in modern history. And those outside the Church who were willing to accept the doctrine of the Primacy, could not but see that in accepting it they had accepted Papal Infallibility as well. But it is much easier to look backwards than forwards; and many prudent and holy men augured the worst possible effects from a definition which has proved to have been of the greatest benefit to Catholic Christianity.

I suppose that the thing which impressed me most at the Vatican Council was the absolute freedom of the Fathers in stating their opinions. Nobody could say that the definition was brought about in a hurry, or without true deliberation. I have heard difficulties stated against the definition outside the Council, but I never heard the difficulties against it put with more cogency or force than within the Council Chamber. Often when one of the Fathers was stating the difficulties in the way of a decision,

My Memories

I trembled for the definition itself. "These arguments," said I, "are so strong they surely can never be answered," and yet they always were answered, and answered triumphantly.

An Œcumenical Council is probably the greatest sight on earth. Bishops were there, not only from the countries of Europe and America, but from the depths of Asia, from darkest Africa, and from the Islands of the sea. There were Bishops of almost all rites recognized by the Catholic Church—Latins, Greeks, Greek Ruthenians, Armenians, Eastern and Western Syrians, Maronites; even the Copts or Christians of Egypt were represented, although the Coptic Patriarchate of Alexandria had not yet been restored. When one considers the difference of customs, of nationality, of points of view, of culture, and yet the unanimity of the decision, one can only adore the Omnipotence of God, Who alone can make men to be "of one mind in a house," and can make brethren, so vastly different in all worldly respects, yet dwell together in the unity of one Faith. There were Bishops there who had been Confessors for the Faith in prison, and there were Bishops there who afterwards died martyrs for the Faith of Jesus Christ. Whenever the Episcopate of the Church is together about the steps of the Throne of Peter, centuries are rolled back and the Church lives again with all the vigour of her pristine youth. If the Bishops of America and England were an example of how the Church could cope with modern problems, the Bishops of Spain were almost living in that wonderful civilization created by the Church in the Middle Ages; the Greek and Ruthenian Bishops were still living in a civilization impregnated with the spirit of Byzantium; and the Bishops from China, Japan, and especially Corea, were striving to make Christianity viable to a still older and still more conservative civilization. There can be no better proof of the contention that the Church is independent of time and place; that she lives in every civilization and can make herself understood by every age, and clime, and people; that she is, in short, the

My Memories

Universal and Catholic religion revealed by God for the salvation of all men.

The next great event in which it pleased Almighty God to give me a part was the triumphant struggle of the Labour organizations to be recognized as lawful by the Holy See. Ever since the Reformation the relations of Capital and Labour had become more and more contrary to the principles of the Gospel. I have said somewhere else that in the sixteenth century practically all Englishmen owned their own homes ; and now that support and buttress is wanting to all but about one-tenth of the population. And what is true of real property is equally true of the means of production. Machinery had gradually lowered the workman to the status almost of a slave ; and it was believed in the 'seventies and 'eighties of the last century that the rights of Capital were so sacred that no aid could be given to the people in asserting their rights without the danger of bringing about the Red Revolution. The excesses of Capitalists on one hand had brought about equal excesses of Socialism on the other—excesses which would be likewise destructive of human liberty and human happiness. For the Socialist State is nothing and can be nothing else than universal slavery, and it is for this reason that the Church has strenuously opposed it. She has ever been the protector of free institutions ; and as she changed the absolute monarchies of the old Roman Empire, and indeed the later monarchies of the Middle Ages, as she changed the Roman Insula generally with its hordes of slaves into the mediæval town, so now would she enfranchise the working classes, not handing them over, bound hand and foot, into the clutches of uncontrolled Capital, and far less sacrificing them to the servile state of the Socialist.

These principles are now taken for granted. Everybody knows where the Catholic Church stands. But it was not so in 1880. I had myself just received the Cardinal's hat when the question of the attitude of the Church toward the Knights of Labour, which was the

My Memories

principal Trades-union of those times, came up for decision; and I can never forget the anxiety and distress of mind of those days. If the Knights of Labour were not condemned by the Church, then the Church ran the risk of combining against herself every element of wealth and power; and at a time when the Pope, having lost his Temporal Sovereignty, was a prisoner in his own palace. But if the Church did not protect the working men she would have been false to her whole history; and this the Church can never be. My great friend and colleague, who fought with me shoulder to shoulder for the rights of the Christian Plebs, has long since gone to his reward; but I cannot speak of this subject without recalling the indomitable courage and perseverance of Cardinal Manning. This great Cardinal should ever dwell in the hearts of Englishmen as a companion figure to that other great ecclesiastic who fought for the liberty of the people so long ago, Cardinal Langton. What a marvellous thing it is to think that after three hundred years of oppression the Catholic Church in England should have been able to give to the English people so soon after the restoration of her Hierarchy such a striking reminder of her glorious past.

It is very difficult in writing Reminiscences of this sort to speak of individuals whom I have known; because, although most of them have passed out of this present life, many of their relations and friends are still living. But I cannot forbear to mention some of the great men whom it has been my privilege to know, as, for instance, the gallant General Sheridan, who was as good a Catholic Christian as he was a good soldier; and the great Mr. Cleveland—undoubtedly one of the foremost statesmen that the English-speaking world has produced in our time. But perhaps my most cherished memory is that of the greatest man whom I have ever known—Cardinal Newman. Many things have been written about this “most illustrious man,” as our late Holy Father, Pius X, called him; but no amount of writing can give the impression which personal contact with him gave. He was like a

My Memories

shining light in a dark place. He produced on one the impression of infinite refinement without any trace of weakness whatever. One felt in him an extraordinary sweetness of disposition, and yet one felt that in the things of God he could be absolutely inflexible. We who knew him were all persuaded, and I think our persuasion was not wrong, that it was he who was to make Catholic Christianity viable to the modern world, as St. Thomas had made it for the mediæval, and Clement of Alexandria for the Greek or Roman world. He had that marvellous gift which only a few historians possess, and which is rarely possessed by a great thinker—the gift of seeing the present in the past, and of judging what would be by what had been. He had a wonderful conception not only of the history of Christianity, but of the history of human opinion generally; and he could tell to a nicety just where the same need of Catholicism would arise again.

Cardinal Newman saw all history as a great tradition wherein every age spoke for itself, and that is the true conception of history. Indeed, it is my excuse for writing this article and for the strong personal note which it cannot help but contain. One of the greatest uses of old age is that old men can speak from personal experience of that which younger men know only from books; and so it is through those whom God has spared beyond the allotted span of human life that tradition really lives, and it is only by a living tradition that history can ever be understood.

JAMES, CARDINAL GIBBONS.

THE SANCTIONS OF PEACE

The City of God. By St. Augustine; English translation by John Healey. Three vols. (Dent.)

The Problem of Human Peace, from the standpoint of a Scientific Catholicism. By Malcolm Quin. (Unwin.)

The German War Book. Translated, with Introduction, by J. H. Morgan. (Murray.)

Lay Down Your Arms. By the Baroness von Suttner. Translated by T. Holmes. (London: Longmans, 1913.)

Pacifist Pamphlets and Speeches. | |

"**H**E who proposes," said Aristotle, beginning the Seventh Book of the *Politics*, "to make inquiry concerning what government is best, ought first to determine what manner of living is most eligible." If the object of the State be that citizens shall lead this most desirable form of life, its constitution, including its rights and duties, may thence be deduced, according to the true idea of human nature. And, in general, as the Philosopher had already taught in his *Ethics*, the end of man's endeavour is happiness, whether of the one or the many. But he now observes, "No one would say that a man was happy who had no fortitude, no temperance, no justice, no prudence." How could any State, or a confederation of States, fulfil its true idea, were these virtues, on a scale commensurate with its magnitude, wanting to it? For, as a greater than Aristotle shows in that strange and wonderful book, Plato's *Republic*, the State is only man "writ large." To speak in the language of the schools, jurisprudence cannot be divorced from ethics. Man is first a moral and then a social being; but from first to last he is under a law that makes for righteousness; and out of that domain, as Burke was never weary of teaching, he cannot stir.

The Sanctions of Peace

Aristotle may be deemed the father of all those who treat the social sciences on principles proper to them, whether like Cicero they take religion into account, or like Machiavelli prescind from it on the cynic maxim, *Deorum injuriæ, diis curæ*. In 1625 there came out at Paris a Latin volume, *De Jure Belli et Pacis*, written by Hugo Grotius the Dutchman, which has been commonly regarded as the first modern treatise on jurisprudence, handled to some extent on this purely natural method. I remember well how, when very young, I read an English translation of Grotius, and learnt in his eloquent pages that there was a "law of nature and of nations," distinct from Church and Bible. Not that so devout-minded a thinker as this man of genius would deny or overlook either. Still, the method was indicated, and the date was significant. Grotius had been meditating on the law of nations since the year 1600, with a view to its application in practice by sea and land. In that year, if I mistake not, the Roman Index recorded its last prohibition of a Protestant work in German, *nominatim*, before the Nineteenth Century. The opening stage of the Reformation was concluded. Europe was broken in twain, Christendom dissolved; the Empire had become mere Austria; and the mediæval or papal system of statecraft had fallen. By 1625, when the Thirty Years' War had been raging for eight seasons, it was clear that the European Powers would never more be subject to a General Council and its decisions, as they were to the Fourth Lateran in 1215. We can see now that, as Machiavelli, writing *The Prince* in 1513, studied the "political man" in the light of pure force, so Grotius, a full century later, desired to contemplate him as the subject of social legislation, especially in regard to his twofold condition of peace and war. While Christendom flourished, its principles embodied in the Canon Law, (which partly controlled and largely inspired the Common Law of the West), had set up a court of appeal over which the Pope presided, making inquiries into a so-called "Law of Nature" theoretical or superfluous. But now, what

The Sanctions of Peace

else could men fall back upon ? The Treaty of Westphalia, signed in 1648, was a strictly secular pact ; and though Grotius did not guide the belligerents who there laid down their arms, his publication is a landmark. It divides the lay science of international law from the Church's tradition.

Yet the Church remains a reality, in some sense wide as the world. Though Europe and America be rent by religious divisions, the human nature with which rulers have to deal shows in the concrete a mingling of Christian elements among its instincts. The Gospel is not entirely a dead letter. Something more must be said. Influences derived from the teaching of the New Testament, and often embodying its ideals in a sort of caricature, have created sects and currents of opinion which Aristotle could not have foreseen, nor Machiavelli smiled upon. Voluntary poverty, vows of celibacy, passive obedience, utter non-resistance, with innumerable other variations on Christian themes, are familiar as adopted, sometimes curiously perverted in the using, by individuals and even whole societies, beyond the Roman pale. When Grotius was dying in 1645, George Fox in England was moving rapidly towards Quakerism with all its fruitful consequences on both sides of the Atlantic. We have heard of the Moravian Brethren, of the Doukhobors in Russia, of L'Enfantin, Saint-Simon, Fourier ; and the growing tendencies to secure by persuasion a perpetual peace have their origin, if not their justification, in the Gospels which not a few of these would-be peacemakers reject.

Catholics, with St. Thomas Aquinas, recognize an Eternal Law, founded on the nature of God Himself, a law in which there is no shadow of turning, which is true and righteous altogether. Revelation does not do away with it ; the Church keeps it ever in view. But since man is a creature who, as Montaigne beheld him, is "*ondoyant et divers*," subject to endless change, the one law needs in this realm of mutability applications and, so to call them, adjustments, fitting each period of human history ; whence comes the struggle between Jacob the

The Sanctions of Peace

wrestler and his good angel, who must prove him ere giving to the stubborn disciple a new and better name, as Israel, "The Prince of God." There is, indeed, a "law of War and Peace" held in commission by Rome, as its divinely appointed guardian. And of it we may say, as did Cardinal Nicholas of Cusa touching God's attributes, that it reconciles in itself perfections which outside it are opposed. It is not a doctrine of peace alone or of war alone. With magnificent assurance both, in the Church's firm grasp, are justified, nay consecrated, according as right requires and love of the brotherhood may claim. If any critic term this position a paradox, the answer is that facts have shown it to be real; that the Church in every age has acted upon it; and that whenever States and peoples follow the guidance of the Holy See before declaring war, and in its prosecution and ending, the hope of realizing ideals by an enduring world-peace will have drawn indefinitely nearer to accomplishment. To state my thesis, not without some audacity, the Church cannot bless any feat of arms which might not take place in a Holy War; and the Crusades were a demonstration of her mission; but she looks forward to the Kingdom of Peace, where the Beatitudes shall find their victory.

These contrasted points of view we light upon in St. Augustine, who was here as elsewhere, when carefully seen into, the great reconciler. To him the story of mankind is a "Tale of Two Cities." When the Roman Empire lay agonizing in the West, and Rome had opened its gates to the tremendous sound of the Gothic trumpet, he felt called upon to justify the ways of God to men. He did so by setting the city of God over against the city of Romulus. He gave to the Platonic idea of "a pattern laid up in Heaven," a name beloved and full of hope; it was Jerusalem, which is, being interpreted, "the Vision of Peace." What was every Christian but the pilgrim of eternity? What heathen Rome but Babylon, opposed in St. John's Revelation to the city coming down out of Heaven? Such are the master-thoughts in St. Augustine's classic and central work, which might have borne

The Sanctions of Peace

on its front as a title, "*The Christian Commonwealth*." He foresaw in germ the distinction between the Sacerdotium and the Imperium, that true foundation of liberty of conscience and all liberties. A discriminating editor has bidden us not to forget how "the Mediæval Church, whose theology is Augustinian, whose interest is 'other-worldly,' is yet in practice the supreme engine of civilization, culture, and development. All the movements towards intellectual or spiritual liberty arose from her, and found counterpart and encouragement within her midst; the disruption was due in the main to accidental causes."* This, again, is a paradox; but an "other-worldly" scope has, beyond question, created the power, as of some transcendent leverage, whereby the earth moves in a grander orbit of ideas. St. Augustine lifted the Roman Empire to the spheres by his very contrast of its vices and its violence with an ideal hovering in the sky above it. There began to be felt an irresistible attraction on both sides; and the Mediæval Papacy, from St. Leo to Innocent III, was the "great Sacrament" that answered it.

St. Augustine could not escape the problem of war and peace, though earlier writers, like Tertullian, might leave it with an epigram, "Were Cæsar to become a Christian, he would be no longer Cæsar." While the heathen ceremonies were bound up with public office, they made it impossible that a good Christian should be a magistrate or a prince, and not easy for him to be a soldier. Opinions such as Tertullian expressed and Origen favoured might bear affinities to modern views held, for example, by Tolstoy. But until Cæsar, in the person of Constantine, literally took the Cross for his standard (the *Labarum*) the real solution of the doubt whether a baptized man could lawfully bear arms or go to war lay beyond the range of inquiry. In concrete matters life is, and must be, the decisive test as giving the facts on which conscience passes judgment. Accordingly, St. Augustine, whose lot was cast under orthodox emperors, speaks with an eye upon

* Dr. Bussell, *City of God*, i, 255.

The Sanctions of Peace

the object ; and what he propounds is to this day, without alteration, what the Church teaches. But he considers himself also to be the spokesman of human nature, of the normal citizen, upon whose collective reason States are founded ; and thus the African Saint answers the question of the Greek philosopher, touching that life which is most to be desired by the pattern man and State.

For on the answer to it, in fine, our quarrel turns. The arrogant German dogma, loud sounding in our ears from voices of statesmen, strategists, and theorists—call to mind now Clausewitz, Moltke, Treitschke, Bernhardt, and the mad prophet of *Zarathustra*—has long been that war is necessary, that it should ever control policy, that mankind lives by it ; and that peace is a word for slaves, that is to say, for Christians. We have heard the cry raised by Teutons of “Odin against Jesus.” The storm-god is to be King. I fancy our cool English thinker, Hobbes, would have smiled at the Northern mythology, while accepting its message, the “War of all against all,” which he held to have been the “state of nature” before his Leviathan city had won its sovereign power. But to St. Augustine the primitive brute recorded in poets’ fables was a “half-man,” because of his “inhuman barbarism.” The Saint wrote under shadow of the coming anarchy, yet in virtue of a tradition the noble outlines of which were still close at hand. It was the “*Pax Romana*,” named first by Seneca (from whom so much that is modern has been quoted) ; and his spirit rejoiced with Pliny in the “*immensa Romanæ pacis majestate*.” So widely and so long had the nations from Euphrates to Atlantic, and from the Libyan Desert to the Batavian Sea, dwelt in wealthy rest. For three centuries and more civilization had been synonymous with peace ; “peace,” Augustine tells his Roman readers, “the greatest wish of the world, as it is the most welcome,” and “the sweetness of which all men do love.” But he could never dissociate the tranquillities of time from the peace of God, man’s true end. Therefore, I will say that in

* Seneca, *De Clementia*, i, 8 ; Pliny, xxvii, 1.

The Sanctions of Peace

St. Augustine's vision the "Pax Romana" becomes transfigured as the "Pax Catholica," brought down to us by the perfect man, Christ Jesus. Theology all this, I grant; nevertheless, we may dimly perceive the lineaments in history of an unfolding plan, such as Augustine felt after in prophetic mood rather than saw.

He is absolute against the ideal of warring tribes, dear to barbarians, to the Germans of Tacitus, to Red Indians and other "half-men," who though baptized in Christ's name had but one conception of virtue, to kill and be killed. "War's aim," he declares, "is nought save glorious peace"; and "all men seek peace by war, not war by peace," to whose benefit we refer all things. Even among wild creatures we note the social instinct, but "far stronger are the bands that bind men unto society, and peace with all that are peaceable." In a dream this ancient Father might have caught a glimpse of Pan-Germanism; "the worst men of all," he says, "would (if it lay in their power) reduce all into a distinct form of state, drawn by themselves, whereof they would be the heads . . . herein is perverse pride, laying a yoke of obedience upon its fellows, under itself, instead of under God. Thus it hates His just peace, and builds for itself an unjust one." We cannot, however, describe St. Augustine as loving peace at any price. The school of George Fox or Richard Cobden would fail to win his adhesion. He knows, indeed, and deplors the fact that "*tantae molis erat Romanam condere gentem*." Foreign wars, civil wars, waged by the Western Babylon, have "troubled the souls of mankind." Be it so, "yea, but a wise man, say they, will wage none but just war." The Saint replies in words that furnish a preamble to the whole Catholic chapter on this heartrending theme, words to be given in full. Listen to our Christian Plato. "Wage none but a just war? He will not! As if the very remembrance that himself is man ought not to procure his greatest sorrow, in that he has cause of just war, and must needs wage them, which if they were not just were not for him to deal in; so that a wise man

The Sanctions of Peace

should never have war ; for that which he ought to lament is the other man's wickedness making the wise man's cause just, whether it produce wars or not. Wherefore, he that does but consider with compassion all those extremes of sorrow and bloodshed, must needs say that this is a mystery ; but he that endures them without a sorrowful emotion, or thought thereof, is far more wretched to imagine he has the bliss of a god, when he has lost the natural feeling of a man."*

There, surely, is the Doctor of Grace at his best, profound, humane, original. He discerns a mystery in war, and he is no more insensible than Tolstoy to the "passion of pity" ; what then shall he do to guide his way of thinking but look to sin as a cause, to justice as a standard, when the brotherhood of man has turned to the strife of Cain and Abel, of Romulus and Remus ? The walls of Rome were laid on foundations red with slaughter. That is, whatever be the explanation, our dismal story. Thousands of wars crimson those pages. If custom, as Pascal marks, be second nature, is not war natural ? Ay, but in a fallen creature. One may copy St. Augustine himself, as he read history, "*Vitium inolevit in naturam*" ; the race of Adam took its vices to be its very genius and art of living ; but that it should do so remains a dark depth not fathomable to any sounding line of ours. The plain lesson is to bear the mystery always in mind. De Quincey may be cited as expanding the pregnant thought of Augustine, much to our purpose :

War (he says) has a deeper and more ineffable relation to hidden grandeurs in man than has yet been deciphered. To execute judgments of retribution upon outrages offered to human rights or to human dignity, to vindicate the sanctities of the altar and the sanctities of the hearth ; these are functions of human greatness which war has many times assumed, and many times faithfully discharged. But behind all these there towers dimly a greater . . . the idea of mixed crusade and martyrdom, doing and suffering, that finds its realization in a battle fought for

* *City of God*, xv, 12 ; Eng. Tr., vol. iii, 142 ; other quotations, 139 seq.

The Sanctions of Peace

interests of the human race, felt even where they are not understood.*

Tertullian wrote in the chiefest of patristic Apologies, "For what war should not we [Christians] have been prepared and prompt, even with unequal forces, we who so willingly are butchered, were it not that according to our rule it is more lawful to be slain than to slay?"† Here is one-half of De Quincey's concept, martyrdom in a good cause. We have come upon the other half in St. Augustine's approval of a just war. Unite both, and the mediæval crusade rises up before us, cross and sword symbolizing holiness armed for battle with Satan's host. Legends taken to the heart of nations celebrate Santiago of Spain, St. George of the East, of Venice, Aquitaine, England, Russia; St. Theodore and St. Stephen, with many another down to St. Louis of France—soldier-saints, doing and suffering on behalf of the Christian folk. The hero, the knight, consecrated to the Holy War, is the Church's creation. We see his prototype in Charlemagne, defender of St. Peter's shrine and successor. The Holy Roman Empire was meant to be a peace which could, if necessary, grasp the shield and couch the lance. Carlyle describes Henry the Fowler, "in the grey dawn of modern history," as "the father of whatever good has since been in Germany"; and why? Because "his standard was St. Michael—whose sword is derived from a very high quarter." To Carlyle he is "a valiant son of Cosmos," one "warring right manfully all his days against chaos"; to Ruskin, still more pointedly, "a mighty soldier in the cause of peace."‡ The Christian paradox already noted by us returns and will return. But what does it amount to, sharply told? That peace, by nature's ordinance, is an end in itself, or rather, is *the* end—"our final good," says St. Augustine—and that the strivings of martial Saints have ever tended to the "victory of eternal peace" by much endurance of hardship, while they beat down

* *On War*, in works, viii, 392.

† *Apology*, ch. 37.

‡ *Frederick the Great*, i, 49, 51.

The Sanctions of Peace

wrong. After this philosophy, the Red Cross knight is a priest who offers his life in sacrifice, as a soldier dying with his Captain Christ—and for Him.

We cannot tear these illuminated pages from the chronicle—I had almost written the Missal—of the Ages of Faith. And what Catholic would dream of such defacement? The Broadstone of Honour, that castled height above the meeting of Rhine and Moselle, is a memorial of days most inspiring, when the Knight's quest was the Christian youth's adventure, seeking peril that he might make an end of injustice, cruelty, miscreancy, and heathendom. In his prayer, the Arthurian champion, Sir Bors, is heard calling on the "Lord Jesus Christ, whose liege man I am." His highest glory was to be "very Knight and Servant" of the Lord Jesu.* Hence the analogy, recognized at an early mediæval date, which undoubtedly exists between the soldier and the priest, with their reciprocal admiration and camaraderie, as of men under the like vows. Hence, too, the Orders of Chivalry, Hospitallers, Templars, Calatrava, Alcantara, the "warrior-castes of Christendom," whose members were no less monks than knights; and despite human frailties, they did in fact save our religion for us from Moor, Saracen, Kurd, and Turk. For some eleven centuries the outer sea of Mohammedan fury was flinging its waves upon our Christian bulwarks; and, if at last the waters have gone down, we owe it to the Popes who preached the Crusades, and to the enthusiasm of youth dedicated by creed and sacrament, which answered their call. Yet from Charlemagne to "Prince Eugene, the noble Ritter," always the monk's device was that of St. Benedict, "Pax"; and with St. Augustine the Church has hoped for "the final victory, to be crowned in perfection of peace." There is no contradiction here; but a mystery beyond question, over which the light cast by St. Michael's glittering sword is ever glancing.

Let us turn, reluctantly, to modern war and peace, both attaining in our own times proportions not

* Digby, *Broadstone of Honour*, ii, 61.

The Sanctions of Peace

hitherto imagined or imaginable. We leave behind "the pomp and circumstance of glorious war," with its Catholic emblazonments—the Knight's vigil under arms in the sanctuary, the quest of the Holy Graal, the Church's dedication of her "elect soldier" to be an anointed King, and the more august uncrowned "Baron of the Holy Sepulchre" who would not be "King in Jerusalem"—all these Crusaders that brought home the "gorgeous East" to the West. And we find ourselves in presence of a drab democracy, British, French, American, with over against it a sort of ghostly Teutonic Order, apostate, Catholic no more, still holding the Prussian lands won by those old chevaliers, and still known as the Junkertum—vowed Christian youths—their Grand Master become King and Kaiser, in the Pope's despite. It is a transition and a fall from grace; it is also the last stage of Feudalism or the caste military fronting the people—the confused, defenceless, industrial crowd, to a lamentable extent proletarian, without an acre to call their own, or any lodging but a tenement. There is never-ceasing strife between the Possidentes and the Non-Habentes; but politicians have agreed to dignify this blindman's buff by the name of peace. What then is war? Fifty years have passed since Ruskin gave its definition, hard and true as a photograph, in *The Crown of Wild Olive*. We read it now and marvel at its accuracy. The prophet asks this question of the powers that be:

If you have to take away masses of men from all industrial employment—to feed them by the labour of others—to provide them with destructive machines, varied daily in national rivalry of inventive cost; if you have to ravage the country which you attack—to destroy, for a score of future years, its roads, its woods, its cities and its harbours; and if, finally, having brought masses of men, counted by hundreds of thousands, face to face, you tear these masses to pieces with jagged shot, and leaving the living creatures, countless beyond all help of surgery, to starve and parch, through days of torture, down into clots of clay—what book of accounts shall record the cost of your work?—what book of judgment sentence the guilt of it?*

* *Collected Works*, xviii, 472.

The Sanctions of Peace

Ruskin concludes: "That, I say, is modern war, scientific war, chemical and mechanic war." To deny his charge would be to fly in the face of facts. Giving credit for the miracles of beneficent surgery which he did not anticipate, how appallingly must we add to the debtor column of "chemical and mechanic" war, with its flame-throwers, choking gases, torpedoes, explosive bullets, zeppelin raids on sleeping cities; then the deliberate murder of non-combatants in open places and on the high seas; the outrages done by order to women and children; the forced deportation in thousands of civilians from their homes to be worked as slaves in their enemy's country? A new term has been imported into official documents, and "frightfulness" becomes the policy by which a neutralized kingdom like Belgium is to be tamed, exploited, and ruined. But worse remains behind. The submarine blockade attempted in all waters does in effect threaten, and could it succeed would ensure a world-famine. It would end civilization. Trade and commerce have bound all States in such a close network of exchange that none can live apart. The "federation of the world," sung by Tennyson, already existed as a commercial union when war broke in upon the freedom of the seas in August, 1914. From that moment the black flag was run up with its piratical device, "Thou shalt want ere I want." Not, be it observed, by Britain, which was willing to exempt food for the civil population from contraband; but by Germany, which pitted nation against nation, instead of armies against armies and fleets against fleets. War had indeed become scientific and mechanic; but in last analysis economic. "What is there to devour, and who shall devour it?" That was the Kaiser's imperial German question, addressed immediately to the Allies, but in due course to Americans and all men.

We have brought our problem of peace and war down to its elementary terms. How astonishing that the march of mind, progress of the species, enlightened Nineteenth Century, and German Kultur, should have come to this! Democracy and Kaiserdom are at death-grips. Berlin is

The Sanctions of Peace

the modern Babylon, fulfilling by its pride and brute force the very description which St. Augustine gave of the Robber-City, heathen Rome, in whose annals, from its foundation until the reign of Augustus, the Saint tells us, "there is but one year reckoned, and that is held as wholly miraculous, which, falling after the first African War, gave the Romans just leave to shut up the gates of war's temple." Prussia, the head of Germany, is by make and history the great War-State, framed for no other purpose, and true to its idea from the beginning. Its Bible is the Book of its Wars. And what of Democracy? Let us count the British Empire, France, Italy, the United States, and South America, to be its leading powers. They live by industry, not rapine; they elect their working rulers; they rest upon the individual and his freedom, not on caste and its privileges. Their aim is self-development, their temper, with exceptions for Latin America, has long been peaceful. Britons, and still more the United States, if they make fresh conquests, do so under compulsion, neither people nor government desiring new burdens of empire. Thus a situation altogether without precedent meets our gaze. The Kaiserdom is a survival from ages when to be at war was the common state of man, but peace, in the words of St. Augustine, a thing wholly miraculous. Balance of power meant alliances, not so much to keep the world quiet as to be ready for the instant aggressor. In a system of trembling forces Louis XIV or Napoleon might be a portent, but neither of them was, so to speak, an anomaly. Place one or the other in London, transfer him to Washington, and how utterly antiquated he would appear, as if some primeval monster of the deep, where "they tare each other in their slime." It is the feeling of this historical incongruity which sets the Kaiser, to us Westerns and democrats, in a ridiculous, comico-terrific light. We cannot, even during the horrors of Armageddon, take him altogether seriously. His armour, his uniforms, his harangues, affect us like the feathers and paint and eloquence of a Cherokee brave on the war-path.

The Sanctions of Peace

A most welcome sign it is ; for when an institution seems in our eyes perfectly grotesque its strength and its sanctity are gone. Europe will not worship Odin any more ; and the Prussian Mumbo Jumbo, though he can rend his victim to shreds, touches no fibre of respect or awe in our composition. He is Attila out of date.

Old European States with dynasties and diplomacies left over from the military period show, no doubt, in their action contradictory strains ; for in none of them do the people yet completely control, even after they have appointed, their government. This notwithstanding, the drift of Liberal nations is manifestly towards a system of peace. In the United States, where yesterday is dead and buried, these entangling cords of the past cannot fetter the present. Yet the American Union has waged one war, admittedly just—a war of “martyrdom and crusade,” plainly in the interest of mankind—the war that abolished slavery. Was it defensive or offensive ? It was both. It conquered the South, and it preserved the Union by restoring it after the Secession. Democracy, then, has brought in a kind of war hitherto scarcely known ; we may call it the humanitarian. Lincoln was an angel of peace, if any man deserved that proud name. Could he, on such a ground, let the South go ? Was he to raise no troops when Fort Sumter fell ? He raised millions, and he said, “Our armies are ministers of good, not of evil.” The verdict of posterity approves. The South itself has no appeal from Lincoln to conscience. Government by the people set itself on everlasting foundations, *in montibus sanctis*, when it freed the slave. Here again the distinction shines out between Assyria-Prussia, making men serfs and women victims of foul desire, and the Voluntary State, which aims at securing to every soul within its borders, “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.” More than one hundred millions, thanks to the genius of America, enjoy these rights and are at peace. They have not seen the shadow of war darkening their home skies during half a century of progress. Its name they have almost forgotten. They

The Sanctions of Peace

are the pioneers of a universal peace by example, and in a much less degree by effort. We may be sure that the United States will never make an attack on the freedom and independence of another people. And, notwithstanding the South African War, which historians will treat as an episode not a main design of Britain, there is a tendency more and more obvious on the part of our own statesmen to keep the Empire within its actual bounds ; while one Commonwealth after another rises to self-government, and peace becomes fixed as if in the course of nature among four hundred and fifty millions, dwelling in all continents, ruling the seas but leaving their pathways free. Moreover, these two spreading branches of a race endowed beyond others with political wisdom, have lived as friends without once recurring to arms over their disputes for a hundred years. The world of King Shakespeare has been, and is likely to be in the future, a world at peace.

No language, in my opinion, however sanguine, can adequately render the growing significance of these phenomena. Were they but accidents in the human story they would call forth our admiration. Accidents, however, they are not, any more than the discovery of America by Columbus or the double dominion by sea and land of the English Crown was an accident. They are chapters in what I have called "the unfolding plan." They answer to the idea of progress ; and, therefore, they tend towards the fulfilment of hopes cherished in every age by those obstinate dreamers, the prophets. To England has been committed the political education of mankind. Our training for the task laid upon us carries our mind far back, to King Alfred and Edward the Confessor, to Runnymede and the Barons of the thirteenth century, to Naseby and the Revolution of 1688. Catholics and Puritans, Whigs and Tories, have all contributed in building the Temple of Hope.

America learned from English ancestors the principles which it handed on to France, though France, thanks to its Latin and Renaissance tradition, has been overslow in

The Sanctions of Peace

learning, and still more in applying them, rightly. England, in short, has found the methods whereby to pass from the military to the industrial régime without annihilating order or making freedom impossible. And the outcome, as events declare, is a change in Western life from the love of war to a detestation of its waste and cruelty as the supreme unreason. War charms no longer; it awakens in sentimental youth no ambition. It had ceased to be interesting to us when German passion for a world-empire flung it like flame on our busy peaceful folk. Americans have turned from the sight with loathing; they have almost denied that such a mad welter and shower of blood were conceivable in the Twentieth Century. "As for war, I call it murder," sang Lowell's jesting-earnest Yankee, when the troubles of Mexico forced his generation to fight. That is to-day the American creed. And the American mother chants defiantly, "I did not raise my boy to be a soldier."

True to our genius for compromise, England pursues after peace by a balance of means cunningly opposed. Until 1914 she had a small professional army, but would not hear of universal military training. She kept her navy out of home waters. She passed, but only for a year at a time, the Mutiny Bill, except for which civilians who enlisted could not be put under martial law. Her "little wars," however frequent, were matters of police rather than of policy. When was the last battle fought in this Island? Few could tell, and fewer have given it a thought. The poet of Imperialism sang with fierce delight of the "price of Admiralty"; he won applause; but his *Barrack-room Ballads* are witness in what disfavour with middle-class, nay with working-class too, the "thin red line of heroes" found itself when it was not in action. To the peerage, baronetage, and county families—may I define them as the circle of Debrett?—the "Services" opened a field of fame; to the great class of "lower middles" they figured as a disagreeable item in the annual "Estimates," to be cut down wherever possible; to the "people," city and suburban, in the factory or on

The Sanctions of Peace

the farm, they showed as a margin of waste for wastrels, a last resource, a kind of workhouse-colony into which unmanageable youths drifted. Devotion to class and country was a heritage in the circle of Debrett. If anyone talked seriously of "patriotism," except on the music-hall stage, to the masses, he would have been thought a little brain-struck. We have seen Lord Roberts, most popular of soldiers since Wellington, yet mocked and flouted when he went about pleading with his countrymen to make England safe before the coming storm. He was in the right, and the nation with its government disastrously in the wrong. But such things go far to prove that where the United States stand now, almost infatuated with desire of peace, Great Britain stood four years ago. Not the peace inflicted, as on the France of 1871, after defeat, but the normal enduring condition of life, as though it were a law like the course of the seasons. To such a habit of mind had their insular or continental security and settled industries on an enormous scale brought these millions. War, beheld from so great a distance, what was it except a wholly superfluous combination of "battle, murder, and sudden death," enhanced by plague, famine, measureless desolation, and ruin on all sides? The very language of civilization is inventive, creative; war seems to have no grammar but that of destruction, no category bound by the moral law. It has been relegated from the human sphere, to play its part with earthquake and volcanic fires. Man, moving upward, leaves it behind him for ever.

Thus do the sovereign "Anglo-Saxon" Commonwealths declare, whose judgment in politics or statecraft must be final, if the stream of history is not to flow back towards primitive barbarism. Reason, at our present stage, condemns war; an evil custom alone defends it. War is no longer an ideal. We may have to endure its ravages; the faculty of admiring it is gone from us. The same causes—universal industry, world-wide exchange of commodities—and the English-American principles operating through democratic institutions,

The Sanctions of Peace

have led to similar consequences in France under the Third Republic, in Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium, and Scandinavia. No revolution of feeling has been more significant in our time than the French hatred and even contempt of military ambition, following upon so much glory linked with Napoleon's "eternity of fame." Even to win back their lost provinces the people would not go to war. They had ceased not only, as Gambetta counselled, to talk of *la revanche* but to think of it. The teachers in Government schools became pacifist by the thousand. The army was decried in writings, lectures, congresses of social workers; and a local militia found advocates among ministers. Peace on earth was to be combined with war against Heaven in the secularist programme. At all events, when the German thunderbolt fell, France, like England, was without any adequate defence, owing to her resolute distrust of the military spirit. As for the countries bordering on Kaiserdom, all they sought was to be let alone. Belgium, Norway, Switzerland, were neutralized by the common law of Europe. Italy, though entering under motives little comprehensible upon a campaign in Tripoli, had every reason, geographic no less than economic, to keep on terms with all the world. Had English principles made their way among Teutons, as they did among Latins, Low Dutch, and Norsemen, the League of Peace inaugurated by Nicholas II of Russia, when the Nineteenth Century was drawing to a close, would have won a complete victory. The natural course of things, as I have pretty nearly demonstrated, was visibly in its favour. On the other side Feudalism, or the Prussian system, represented the Old Guard, who would die, if they must, but not surrender.

War, then, is now reaction, when it is unjust; and when it is just, it is self-defence. The Kaiser is the ghost of the Holy Roman Empire turned Protestant; in shining armour, like Hamlet's deceased parent, he revisits the glimpses of the moon. He is neither Catholic nor humanitarian. I consider this to be the dominant fact

The Sanctions of Peace

on which the present and future of history depend. It will at once be perceived how exactly this view tallies with St. Augustine's distinction between the reign of force and the reign of justice ; while from another prospect we observe that the human is not to be set opposite the Christian height, but is less exalted and looks up to the Mount of Beatitudes as its crest and crown. I quoted at the beginning the Saint's anticipation of " the last victory, to be crowned in perfection of peace " ; doubtless an achievement beyond man's natural powers. But words like these betray the profound sympathy of the Church as Christ's Kingdom on earth with all true strivings after brotherhood among the sons of Adam.

Here we come in view of the Great Divide which we have always to consider since the philosophy known in Tractarian Oxford as " Liberalism " drew up its chart of progress. The question is, shall what is left of good in human nature be held as a preparation for the Gospel or set forth as an Evangel in its stead ? It is the question brilliantly stated by Comte, and by him resolved (I pass over his nomenclature) in favour of the new Evangel. A recent writer, Mr. Malcolm Quin, handles it once more with conviction in his volume on *The Problem of Human Peace*, which he undertakes to study " from the standpoint of a scientific Catholicism." We are thus brought back, it would appear, after winding ways of thought, to my early friend, Grotius, with his law of nature and of nations; but let us not overlook the difference. Grotius would have died rather than deny the supernatural Christian Revelation, on behalf of which he suffered grievously at the hands of Dutch Calvinists. Mr. Quin, if I do not entirely mistake him, is a disciple of Comte, in whose eyes the Supernatural was a defunct mythology. By " scientific Catholicism " we must understand a Pope, Hierarchy, Sacraments, Dogmas, all " trans-valued," as Nietzsche would say, into terms of the present world, their " other-world " equivalence being simply zero. Comte perceived, and has expressed with rare eloquence, the earthly grandeur of the Church during the Middle

The Sanctions of Peace

Ages. He dreamt of its restoration as furnishing the ideal elements and the motive force required to lift mankind out of the slough called "Materialism," into the air and light of a loving Humanity. These not unwinning strains we have heard from George Eliot and her "choir invisible." But their burden ever is, "No God, no Christ, no Heaven"; their message, "This world is all." Man, therefore, must be sufficient for himself; the "Kingdom of Christ" denotes a stage, the last and best, in his evolution. He will attain to peace from love of the ideal within him. He will transcend war, as he will one day have put aside the old religions, the abstract philosophies, in which he trusted. The Catholic Church, thus transfigured, will have been a forecast of human solidarity.

This was Comte's idea. Supposing it to be Mr. Malcolm Quin's, I distinguish in it the vast undeniable truth which exhibits the Catholic Church as the central history of mankind. A momentous truth, the neglect of which has cost Europe agonies of isolation and dislocation. For Catholic Rome, so Providence ordains, must ever be the one sure pivot of the balance of power. It has been thrust aside, and we watch our civilization staggering along until it is now heading for the General Overturn. But I detect a fallacy likewise in Comte and in Comte's disciple. Both imagine that there dwells at the heart of Humanity without God a force of right thinking and unselfish willing which is inexhaustible, capable in due time of making our human world perfect. This I call the delusion of "the perpetual motion" applied to man. An infinite source of power will exist in an infinite system; it lies not in us. Too well do we know our bounds; we faint and fail; our efforts to improve "*ce Grand-Etre*" come lamentably short of our hopes. The vague declamations in Mr. Quin's pages reveal his want of anything solid to offer his afflicted brethren; they can only serve to refute a science which has neither fulcrum nor lever whereby to move the universe. The potential energy we need must be sought elsewhere.

Assuredly, Catholicism means, "a continuous and

The Sanctions of Peace

organized attempt, individual and social, to realize in man an ideal or type of Perfection, considered as being given and symbolized in Christ." But were Christ only man, and His Father in Heaven a myth, how limited would be His power, and consequently ours, of realizing any ideal! For the ideal, as Plato saw, is eternal in essence and transcends the world of time, whence it can move all earthly aspirations to desire it, and can itself fulfil them. The Middle Ages were great because their vision reached unto Heaven, and they were not "time's fool," as of necessity those periods are which see "the human sky" one day to be rolled up, "like a scroll within a tomb, unread for ever." Monks and saints who fled from the world somehow built better "in the waste wilderness." Had the Church been a self-contained Idealism, not founded on "the powers of the world to come," her message would be nothing but the echo of her own voice, a faint reflection of man's desires and, at best, an amiable delusion. Such was Comte's Positivism; such it remains. What, indeed, is its project but a reversal of reason, that it may, in the stinging words of the *Dunciad*,

Make God man's image, man the Final Cause?

But, granting that "the good which was left" in Adam's children never could be a substitute for the "grace and truth" that "came by Jesus Christ," we have still to inquire in what sense it deserves to be held a preparation for the Gospel. That is the question, every day more pressing, which the leader of the Tractarians handled like a master from one point of view, the same, though not with any direct reference to Comte, which I have just taken. There is, however, when we have thus cleared the ground, another more promising, also familiar to Newman. We find it occupied by Clement of Alexandria, by St. Augustine, by St. Thomas Aquinas. Putting the matter plainly, I would term this principle the reconciliation of philosophy with religion, or of Plato and Aristotle with the Catholic Church. And I would go one step onward, humbly following in the wake of the

The Sanctions of Peace

Franciscan school led by Scotus, who drew from suchlike premises most comfortable words for days in store. What is the idea? Simply this: We should look upon the present order of Providence as one in design and execution from beginning to end. It is not the drama of mere human effort failing and abandoned, while the order of grace, leaving these rejected natural virtues behind, soars up to Heaven. No, the plan is single, all-embracing, without waste or remnant; whatever good has been or shall be anywhere belongs to the Kingdom, and Christ will claim it as His own. As men talk now with justice of the "unity of science," so may Christians extol the consistency of goodness. The Alexandrian Clement wrote that "to the Greeks philosophy was given as their peculiar covenant, being itself a footstool of the philosophy of Christ." Put "men of good will" for "Greeks," and the argument need not appear less cogent. In all strivings after goodness the "secret presence of God" is surely to be acknowledged. And can those good acts remain disconnected, as if in worlds not realized, mere links of a broken chain, having neither part nor lot in the divine scheme of redemption? It is hard to think so. History does not exhibit two parallel lines of Nature and Grace never meeting. If science is a whole, so is history; and Nature has at no time been left utterly to itself.

Considerations like these, if true of the old Greeks, will be relevant yet more to the many "movements," as we term them, of human kindness prompted by belief, however imperfect, in one or other Gospel teaching, so far as they did not, on the matter of their enthusiasm, contradict our creed. The touchstone, separating gold from alloy, will be ever in the hands of authority. Let me instance the crusades of modern times against the slave trade and slavery, against intemperance, the "social evil," corrupt literature, and now the Crusade of Peace, which we are dealing with. Dross, not sparingly, has been mingled with fine gold. The profound truth held by Aristotle, confirmed by Catholic wisdom, that virtue lies in a mean, fails to win the extremes of Right and Left;

The Sanctions of Peace

and Pacifist meets Militarist in battle array to the general confusion. One part of God's plan is dashed against another, until the whole would be wrecked, were His counsels not clearer than our short sight. Meanwhile, the Church weighs in her balance peace and war, according to the standard of equity. She knows which is the "most eligible life," individual and social. She does not exempt the State from the laws of ethics. Prudence, justice, fortitude, temperance, are not mere private virtues. In her judgment peace, not war, is the normal condition; for men are brethren. But she consecrates the sword of justice borne by the chief ruler, as she preaches obedience to the civil magistrate. "Ecclesia abhorret a sanguine" is the maxim of Canon law. The clergy did what in them lay to tame Feudalism by the "Truce of God," the right of sanctuary, and the crusades themselves, which lent to warfare, otherwise tribal or marauding, an ideal aim. Conclude once more with our philosopher-saint that "peace is war's purpose, the scope of all military discipline, and the limit at which all just contentions level."*

It is meeting the Peace movement on the heights if I now quote an American diplomatist and jurist, Dr. Van Dyke, addressing lately some of his fellow-citizens in London. I do not remember a more concise and happy drawing of its present platform. Dr. Van Dyke said :

Let us be loyal to our own American principles. Certain great ideals have created and guided the development of the United States—the consent of the governed as the foundation of government; the sacred right of the nations small and great to a sovereignty and independence which respect the rights of others; the freedom of the seas which necessitates the suppressing of piracy and the cleaning out of sea-wolves; the sanctity of scraps of paper to which honourable names are signed; finally, after a righteous peace has been restored to the world, a general and concerted reduction of armaments, which will change them from a perpetual menace to a common protection of order, under the

* *City of God*, xv, 12; Vol. iii, 140.

The Sanctions of Peace

moral guidance of a League of Nations, which will amount to an open alliance against aggressive war. . . . In that victorious peace may our country share with all who love it, and are willing to give their life to defend and uphold it.*

So far as my reading extends there is not a word in this declaration of the rights of peace and war which a General Council might not pass and the Pope approve. It expresses the very virtue in a mean that we were seeking. It gives point and edge to the saying of a renowned pacifist, driven by the logic of facts to grant that "the pieties of a peace movement which stops at sentiment delude the country during peace, and are swept away during a war."† It calls up a vision of the next Conference at The Hague (timed to meet in this year of crisis, 1917) with delegates of the victorious Allies, and of the United States, representing nine hundred millions of the world's inhabitants, some thirty million square miles of its territories, and the sovereignty of the seas; while the Central Empires defeated bring their guilt and shame to judgment. Never was there such a Great Assize. And who shall be the Chief Justice? For it is to be a day when "Mercy and truth are met together; righteousness and peace have kissed each other." The Allied ambassadors will stand for the law of nature and of nations, vindicated by the sword, to be established by the potential energy of these millions and their wide dominions. Who will stand for the Law of Christ? There is one august figure—one, and one only—to be named on such a day, and in this Parliament of Man. Enemies point him out as clearly as his most devoted friends and loyal children. He is the bearer of the keys, "Servant of the servants of God," uniting in his own person the Rome of the Cæsars with the Rome of the Apostles; and as Leo XIII warned the Conference at The Hague, which would not give him a share in its deliberations, he is by divine appointment "the mediator of peace." The Church is the Christianity

* *The Morning Post*, Feb. 17th, 1917.

† *National Defence*, by J. R. Macdonald, p. 28.

The Sanctions of Peace

of past and present ; the Papacy controls a moral and supernatural influence capable of new-creating civilization. It is to be hoped that The Hague Conference, whenever it assembles, will think on these things and act on them.

WILLIAM BARRY.

THE CROSS AND THE SWORD

“YOU have seen there are carabinieri travelling by this train?” asked the Italian officer who, up to that moment, had not found me worth a remark, though he favoured me the more with looks of suspicion. We were in the train between Rapallo and Genoa, and were alone. I answered I *had* seen the carabinieri. Impossible to deny it, as they had just passed along the corridor. “Spies are arrested every day on this train,” continued the young officer. I saw what he was driving at, and showed my colours by handing him my card with my Italian address printed upon it. This led to conversation. The young lieutenant, who seemed to be about twenty-five years old, had travelled a good deal, and, like many of his generation, had studied in Germany. We compared notes on German cities and customs, and after a discussion on morals we arrived at the subject of religion.

“I am a Catholic, Cattolico Apostolico Romano,” said the dashing young officer, “but I must confess that before the war I had not much truck with religion. Then I went to the front, and there I learnt to pray. Mass in the trenches is different from Mass at home, when the priest rattles off his Latin, and a dirty altar-boy makes the responses, turning round between whiles to signal to his friends in the church. And the guns preach a better sermon than any Capuchin. When you have seen what I have seen—for instance, a shell falls amongst a group of four officers: when the smoke clears away, a heap of flesh remains, and from a tree hangs a newly-torn leg, still warm——” The young officer fell silent. He had spoken in a curt and almost brutal way. Then he looked out of the window. For a few minutes he could not go on.

The line runs along the shores of the Genoese Riviera. Fishermen are dragging in their boats on the russet beach that runs down to the bluish-green sea. The deep Nervi

The Cross and the Sword

gardens are full of flowers. Women are standing on doorsteps in the sunshine with babies in their arms. Here peace is still a reality. But the train rushes, rushes, rushes to the other reality, the great blood-red reality of the war.

As railway-reading I have Ernest Psichari's *Le Voyage du Centurion*. Ernest Psichari!—one knows from whom he descended by nature. He has the same baptismal name as his grandfather, Renan, whose *Vie de Jésus* is read as a novel—the Ernest Renan who, with Hippolyte Taine, is the brilliant French twin-star on the spiritual horizon of the middle of the last century: Ernest Renan and the daughter of the devout painter, Ary Scheffer. The issue of the union between the renegade priest and the Calvinist woman was a daughter, who, by a Greek father, gave birth to another Ernest. Renan died; and the new Ernest, Ernest Psichari, grew up and became a smart officer—such another as he who is reading in a corner of the compartment the latest number of *Noi e il Mondo*.

But this young Frenchman did not wait for the guns to preach to him before he returned to the Church which his grandfather had left. When "Agathon" published, in 1913, his Report on *Les jeunes gens d'aujourd'hui*, one of the contributors was Lieutenant Ernest Psichari, "recently returned from Africa." This young officer, in the French Colonial Army, wrote the following answer to the questions put to him: "The young men of the present day have more moral backbone than those of the preceding generation. We are conscious of an appalling responsibility; we have an oppressive certainty, which never for a moment leaves us, of an overwhelming obligation. Our generation—I speak of those whose manhood began with the opening of the century—is full of significance. All hopes are centred in us, and we know it. On us depends the salvation of France, that is to say, of the world and civilization. Everything rests upon us." Written in 1912-13, the following lines read now like prophecy: "It seems to me that the young men are dimly conscious

The Cross and the Sword

that they will see great things, and that great things will be done through them. It will not fall to their lot to become amateurs or sceptics. They will not go through life like tourists. They know what is expected of them."

A certain set of the new generation, Psichari felt, is too much interested in sport. The word "intellectual," he says, has almost become a term of abuse. But these young men, he predicts, will return to French traditions, "and Roosevelt's *strenuous* life will become a horror to them." For, with a Frenchman, intelligence holds the supreme place. Young men, returning to Christian traditions, remember that Catholic teaching accords with French thought. There was "our dear Jacques Maritain," for instance, who bears witness: "Supernatural understanding is the second of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. It is that for which the Psalmist pleads with such wondrous earnestness—*intellectum da mihi*. With the understanding shall we one day behold God. Our intelligence is just as valuable to God as our heart, and, in order to preserve it, he sends us nothing less than the peace that passes all understanding." This, say the young men of France, is the intelligence which the old "intellectuals" degraded. The young will watch over it as over their dearest.

The manhood of Ernest Psichari began, as he says, with the beginning of the century. He was born in Paris in 1883, and in 1902 he took his degree as a Licentiate in Philosophy from the Lycée Henri IV. While serving his time as a soldier he conceived the desire of becoming an officer and going to the Congo under Colonel Leufant, whence he returned home, in 1908, decorated with the Military Medal. At the same time he began to write; and, during that year, published a collection of impressions entitled *Terres de soleil et de sommeil*. He became an officer at the School of Artillery at Versailles, and spent three years (1909-12) in Mauritania, dividing his time between warlike exploits and philosophical meditations. The desert made him think, and "think things out." Returning to France he brought with him the manuscript of a book "begun in the ardour of a man's twenty-sixth

The Cross and the Sword

year and completed in my tent in the Sahara." The novel, *L'appel des armes*, is dedicated "to our master, Charles Péguy," to him "whose spirit accompanied me in the loneliness of Africa, that other lonely one in whom the soul of France dwells now, and whose work has forced our young men on their knees for love." A dedication that is in itself a confession; for Charles Péguy (that strange spirit and completely peculiar poet, without whom the new France is inexplicable) is the great sign-post pointing from "Modern thought" back to the old Cathedrals and, as a kneeler, to the everlasting altar. Like Péguy, Ernest Psichari became a believing and practising Catholic.

At Cherbourg, where he was then stationed, Ernest completed, in the beginning of 1914, the book I am now reading, *Le Voyage du Centurion*. He wrote it (as he says himself in a letter to Paul Bourget) "in trembling, because he was face to face with the Most Holy Trinity." Before the book was printed the war broke out. On August 22nd, 1914, Lieutenant Psichari fell in the action at Roissignol, near Charleroi in Belgium, defending his battery to the last. He was thirty years old. The book came out after his death.

There has been no lack of conversions in France during the latest decades. From Verlaine and Huysmans, Coppée and Léon Bloy, the list of literary conversions is continued by Brunetière and Bourget to Paul Claudel, Francis Jammes, Charles Péguy, Henri Lavedan, Charles Morice. But the delightful distinction of the most recent converts of the Twentieth Century is their youth. There is a sadness in seeing the forty and fifty-year-olds gathering up the remnants of themselves, not always *les beaux restes*, and gravely surrendering them to God. The French persecution of the Church helped to change this. Youth, in its generous idealism, will always learn the lesson of the persecuted. While the *Ecole Normale*, only ten years ago, could hardly count three or four Catholics within its walls, immediately before the war no fewer than forty (a third of the pupils) were ardent

The Cross and the Sword

Catholic Christians. Joseph Lotte (since then killed in action, like so many of the best young men in France) gathered about his *Bulletin des professeurs catholiques de l'Université* a staff of eighteen Professors at the University, and one hundred and ninety-six grammar-school masters. And these new Academic young men, who go to Mass, have created a new, young literature. To mention the most prominent names: André Lafon (also killed in action), François Mauriac, Robert Vallery-Radot, Armand Praviel, Charles Grolleau, André Delacour, Louis Pize, Jean Variot, Paul Bonté, and—in Belgium—Pierre Nothomb, Hugues Lecocq, Georges Virrès, Bruno Destrée.

Though not belonging to any group or any school, Ernest Psichari was closely related to these. He, in whose veins such different blood was mingled—Celtic, Greek, Teutonic—had, like his contemporaries, the pure consciousness of *being* French, and of feeling that he *ought to be* French. Péguy had taught him this; and Maurice Barrès, I imagine, and Charles Maurras. The hero in *L'appel des Armes*, the officer Nangès, goes one Sunday morning in spring with a friend through Paris and meets the white-clad companies of little girls coming from church and their First Communion, led by Sisters, and hidden in veils like little brides. And the following words pass between friend and friend: "That is the result of the campaign that France has conducted against the Church. Never, I think, have there been so many of those little girls as this year. I believe the Church is growing strong in her sufferings. And not only is the endurance of Catholicism admirable—it is the whole race that will not forsake its beautiful traditions." Nangès is a son of tradition.

Nangès is also a soldier, and as such an enemy of *le bourgeois*, the smug middle-class citizen. Instinctively he loves that of which the Philistine is afraid. "The *bourgeois*," says Nangès, "is afraid of that which he does not understand. He quakes when he hears talk about infinity—about the absolute. He is afraid of the Sahara

The Cross and the Sword

as he is afraid of Wagner's music." In the desert, in solitude, beneath the immense blue and luminous star-lit night, the soldier meets another who, like himself, is not afraid of the absolute, that is, the priest. Both have understood—what average modern human beings do not understand—that *liberty is the ideal of slaves. He who belongs to the nobility desires to obey.* In *L'appel des Armes* there are a father and a son, Sébastien Vincent and Maurice Vincent. The father is a schoolmaster, of the old free-thinking type; the son wishes to be a soldier because he desires to serve. "Maurice," says Psichari, "was of the race of free men, and desired nothing but to surrender himself. Sébastien came of a race of thralls and proclaimed the independence of emancipated reason." He had the charcoal-burner's faith in "Progress"—common to all ignorant minds. How could the history of twenty centuries be compared to it? But history revenged itself, and confronted this man with a youth who obeyed only his heart and dared to listen to the voices of the past—a child in whom the refined culture, the courtesy, the earnestness and nobility of soul of twenty centuries arose to new life. "Sébastien would like to scorn the soldier, as he would like to scorn the saint and the poet." The warrior, the saint (namely, the priest), the poet! Baudelaire, too, once placed these three side by side. And Ernest Psichari, on his own account, takes up the liberal catchword about "the alliance between the sabre and the holy-water sprinkler" and gives his consent to it. By Sword and by Cross! "They are," he says, "two very good symbols of two dogmas; signs of two systems. Two metaphysics, mutually differing, by no means allied or in league against a common foe—on the contrary they are divided. And yet the two signs meet, and they stand together in the heavens, side by side, in a halo of supernatural radiance. For all mysticism has one common mark, and this mark is to seek an exalted passion that tears us out of ourselves and compels us to weep with love." The seeking for this passion, the longing to weep those tears, and how the seeker finds.

The Cross and the Sword

his way into port and his longing finds relief in tears—that is the theme of *The Centurion's Journey*.

Who is the centurion mentioned here? The reader, familiar with his Bible, has already guessed—it is the Centurion of the Eighth Chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, he who says to the Master: "Lord, I am not worthy that Thou shouldst enter under my roof; say but the word and my servant shall be healed. For I also am a man under authority, having soldiers under me, and I say to one, Go, and he goeth, and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it." The hero in *Le Voyage du Centurion* is, then, one who obeys. We, who were young in the century of disobedience, and whose plebeian nature knew only one solution, "Emancipated!" should feel ashamed and edified at the sight of this new, young generation of nobility, whose ambition is to serve. Maxence, we are told of Psichari's other self, had been brought up far from religious influence, the son of a colonel of literary tastes, a disciple of Voltaire who translated Horace. But Maxence had a soul: "He was born to believe, to love, and to hope. And he could not endure that truth and purity should only be words, with no root in reality." This soul has one longing—to seek solitude. O all you, who suffer from an unknown pain, all you who have lost your way and are bewildered, do like Maxence, flee from the lies of cities, go out to those uncultivated regions that seem to come still warm from the hands of the Creator, stay there amidst the elements and try to find again the features in the calm and unchangeable countenance of truth. Africa, the Sahara, "the pale rose-coloured desert," becomes the home of his soul. He knew that Africa brings great things to pass; from Africa, therefore, he could demand everything, and, through Africa, from himself. From Africa, symbol of eternity, he could demand the true, the beautiful, the good, all eternity. "The rule of Africa's order is silence. As a monk observes silence in his cloister, so the desert observes silence in its white habit."

Maxence thus feels like a silent, industrious and con-

The Cross and the Sword

scientious monk in the endless cloisters of his monastery. He leads his men, fights against rebellious tribes, administers justice between the Arabs who come to him in the cool of the evening. He talks with priests of Mahomet and dreamers of Islam, and feels that amongst them he is the ambassador of western civilization, the torch-bearer of Christianity. But when a Sheik or a Nabi questions him about his faith he answers evasively—he explains to them what *the others* believe—why? Maxence knows what it is to serve, to be the man on whom the chief relies, and the faithful servant who carries out an order accurately and obeys a command. Why, then, if he is a faithful soldier, so many falls to which he has consented, and so many denials of which he has been guilty? If he abhors progress, why does he reject Rome, the touchstone of all fidelity? And if he contemplates the unchangeable sword with eyes of love, why does he turn away from the unchangeable Cross?

In this way Maxence reaches the point at which he feels that a choice must be made. Either he must reject all authority, and with that, the army; or he must accept all authority, human and divine. In the world of order there is the priest and there is the soldier. The world of disorder has neither. But in the world of order all things are connected one with the other. Just as France cannot deny the Cross of Christ, so the army cannot deny France. And the priest can no more deny the soldier than the soldier can deny the priest. It is a case of being a recusant or an infidel—to be *with* those who rebel, or *against* them.

But Maxence—and with him Psichari—is no pragmatist, saying: "This is useful, therefore it is true." On the contrary, he wishes passionately for Truth, he demands proof that Jesus Christ is really the Word of God, that the Church is really and truly the infallible guardian of Truth, and that Mary is indeed the Queen of Heaven: "Nothing is beautiful except that which is true. If Mary is not really Our Lady, then let Notre Dame be razed to the ground! If Christianity is a lie, then let France perish, and her twenty Christian centuries be

The Cross and the Sword

blotted out of history—let this Christian France be accursed if it has been built up on error and wrong!" There are no useful lies, no profitable illusions, as so many believe: in the desert Maxence learns the true value of a mirage. "A misty religious consolation fills him with loathing; for him no other consolation exists but the clearness of noon-day and radiant certainty." In this frame of mind he utters his first prayer:

O God in Heaven, if Thou existest, then behold my misery! Behold the disorder in which I live. Behold, on one hand, I desire a law of life that will preserve me from sin, and on the other I demand that this law shall accord with the Truth and be raised above human needs. Behold my heart, Lord, which desires Thy peace; and behold my thought, which will have none of this peace if it be built upon a lie. O Heavenly Father, Thou understandest that I have no need of a shadow, and that no dreams can comfort me in this great earthly battle in which I have to fight! For I am a real man in a real world, and I am a soldier, struggling in the real conflict of life.

This is no sensuous æsthete, intoxicating himself with church incense, stained-glass windows, and Gregorian chants. This is no Modernist who doubtfully dares to believe, while he cherishes a lurking hope in his heart that at most dogma is a symbol, the sign of an incomprehensible reality—or perhaps merely a beautiful dream. This is no "Broad" Protestant distinguishing between the Resurrection as a truth of Faith and the Resurrection as a fact, accepting the one, rejecting the other. This is a man whose speech is "Yea, yea," and "Nay, nay," and whose sword cuts straight through all the beautiful silken wrappings in which his illustrious grandfather shrouded his denials. Did a Virgin bring forth, or did she not bring forth? Did Jesus of Nazareth rise from His grave alive, or did He see corruption like all the seed of Adam? Did He stand, risen, amongst His disciples on one of the hills of Galilee, did His feet mount slowly from the stone on which He stood, and did they see Him disappear slowly amongst the clouds—those who had known Him

The Cross and the Sword

in His life-time, and who could not be mistaken in Him, the fishermen, Peter, Andrew and John ? These are the questions—the “confounded questions,” as Heine calls them ; and Psichari the soldier wants an answer to them, which shall be as clear as a command and as honest as an old officer’s blue eyes.

Thus thought Maxence towards the close of his first year in the Sahara. He felt his interior receptivity increase, and the circle of his spiritual capacity extend. In that boundless loneliness, during marches and in encounters by night with Arabs who attack the small French force, he holds his dialogue with a silent God : “Maxence dimly perceives that the highest to which mankind can attain is that state in which freedom and obedience, striving and impatience, melt into one, and this state is only attained in Jesus Christ.” Still Maxence hesitates to accept the invitation to the Great Supper. “Lord,” he exclaims, “whither shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life. But our hearts are still too narrow. We have not yet deserved to know Thee. We do not yet give ourselves utterly to Thee.” “I long for regeneration,” he says ; “I long really to live at last.” Maxence says his yea at last, and has his reward : “What joy is mine ! Already I feel the new life streaming into me in all its freshness. The spirit within me is free, it rises to the surface like a float that is liberated from the mud. My spirit is free on the waters, on the everlasting waters that have been divided from the corruption of the earth. Oh, sweet freshness ! What joy, what peace !” All doubts are silenced, and Faith sings her hymn of praise. Ernest Psichari, flesh of Renan’s flesh and blood of Renan’s blood, kneels on the desert sand beneath the infinite blue dome and makes his confession of faith : “Man needs God ; Jesus gives God in giving Himself. Man needs holiness ; Jesus comes and it stands revealed. Jesus is the equipoise of the world ; He is the fulfilment of all that is human and all that is divine. He is the ring that was lacking, the marriage ring that joins the old covenant with the new. He is the meeting of man with

The Cross and the Sword

God—the unique meeting, from which has sprung the spark of love.”

“God, soul, immortality—good, old, somewhat rough words, which we have no objection to retaining, but to which we give a new meaning,” wrote Ernest Renan once, and in all the haunts of Positivism and Free-thought heads were bowed in assent. The God Whom Ernest Psichari invokes in the Sahara is the old, plain-spoken God. “He is the Father Who loves us, Who desires that we should be free and happy. He is not a principle, or an idea, or a dogma. He is our Father and our Friend and our Brother. He is not a word or a chimera, He is One by Whom we are nourished. He is not ‘Goodness’ or ‘Reason’ or ‘The Ideal.’ He is a Person: He is Jesus Christ, the Mediator; the Second Person of the Trinity; true Man and true God; the unique proof of the existence of God, the source of all virtue, our Gate of Heaven and our Leader to eternal life.”

JOHANNES JÖRGENSEN.

[This chapter is in some sort a Prologue to the distinguished Danish author's record of his visit to “austere Paris” and to the Belgian Refugees in France. The English translation (by Miss Ingeborg Lund) is promised under the title of *The War Pilgrim* by Messrs. Burns and Oates.]

FROM THE TRENCHES : A PLEA AND A CLAIM

WHEN War was declared by England the whole world turned to see what Ireland would do. That a certain number of Irishmen would fight bravely in the British Army was expected. That had always been the case, even in days when the spirit of Ireland was troubled and when disaffection for British Rule was most rife. But what the world wanted to know was what Ireland as a whole—that is, including Nationalist Ireland—would do. Would the Irish take the side of England and France, or would they, as the Germans hoped, either stand coldly neutral or else openly take up arms against their old hereditary enemy, England?

It is true to say, that in the past Nationalist Ireland had never, since the destruction of the Irish Parliament at any rate, whole-heartedly identified itself with any of England's struggles. In the fateful days of August, 1914, people wondered what Ireland's attitude would be towards the great war which was about to begin. It was, then, with a sense of grateful relief, that the British people heard the pronouncement of the Leader of the Irish party in Parliament that Ireland's loyalty and co-operation in the coming struggle might be counted upon. In Germany there immediately broke out a manifestation of strong rage, and the Nationalist Leader became the object of the most bitter attacks in the German Press. And yet Germany had no claim whatever upon Irish consideration. With almost every country in Europe, Ireland had more sympathy than with Germany. With France, Irishmen had had, from time immemorial, historical and traditional connection. France, at any rate, had made some efforts to relieve Ireland from suffering and oppression, whilst Germany had never lifted a finger, or spoken a word, or exercised the slightest influence towards the

From the Trenches :

mitigation of the conditions under which Irishmen were governed.

As between Germany and France, therefore, it caused no surprise to the student of history that Irishmen should prefer to fight upon the side of the French. What did cause surprise in some quarters was that Ireland, through her representatives, should take the side of England in the war, and that Irishmen should flock by tens of thousands into the Army. And yet this attitude of Ireland only made good and bore out the pledged word of Irishmen that, under certain circumstances, they would loyally take their part in the defence and maintenance of the great Empire, which Irishmen had helped largely to create. What were these circumstances ? They involved the granting to Ireland of Self-government or Home Rule. From the earliest days of the Home Rule movement down to the days of Parnell and Redmond, it had been always steadfastly proclaimed by Ireland that if she had her own Parliament restored, she would take her place frankly and fully in the Empire. In 1914, just before the Declaration of War, the British people, through the majority of their representatives, passed through Parliament the Bill establishing Home Rule. Shortly afterwards this Bill received the Royal Assent and passed to the Statute Book. It is true Home Rule did not come into operation, and the Irish people were disappointed when they were told that, pending the War, they would have to wait for the establishment of their Parliament. Still, the victory was won. Home Rule was the law of the land, and, in spite of their disappointment, the Irish people felt that the King and representatives of the British people had conceded their country's claim. Was it conceivable then that Ireland should refrain from carrying out her own pledged word to take her share in the defence of the Empire, having had her claim to her Parliament ratified by the British electorate and sealed with the Royal Assent ? Britain had kept her share of the compact as to Home Rule, and it was for Ireland to show that she was ready before the world to keep her

A Plea and a Claim

share in the Home Rule compact as well. From every platform in Great Britain the Irish Members, with the assent of their constituents, declared that the granting of Home Rule would be the beginning of a new era of friendship and brotherhood between the peoples of the two Islands. Here and there may have been a voice of dissent, but no one can doubt that the Irish representatives spoke with the assent of the overwhelming mass of the Irish people. Had not the Boers kept their pledge to work loyally in the Empire, having been granted freedom in their own country? The Irish surely could do no less. The world-wide sympathy which had been instinctively given to Ireland in her struggles would have been withdrawn in amaze had the Irish people signalized the passing of Home Rule by placing themselves in alliance with the German and the Turk against England. Sympathy with France, horror at the unprovoked destruction of Belgium, these things undoubtedly affected Ireland's attitude in the war; but what affected and brought about that attitude more than all the rest was the feeling which prevailed, and still undoubtedly does prevail, that Home Rule, though in abeyance, is still the law of the land, and that, therefore, it is Ireland's duty to act as her representatives declared she would act, if her claims were conceded by the British people. In other words Ireland is overwhelmingly with England in this war on the faith of Home Rule—about which the Germans were so solicitous in a recent note, but about which they said not a word in times gone by.

Even had Home Rule not been passed, the sympathy of Ireland would still have been overwhelmingly for Belgium and for France, where the people are, after all, by race and by religion, closely akin to her own. In Australia and Canada, and all through the Empire, there are millions of the Irish race engaged in the war, and Ireland could never be indifferent to their struggle. For Germany, on the other hand, Ireland can have no natural sympathy, or for the iron sway of the great military machine which oppresses and darkens the lives of the

From the Trenches :

masses of the working people. In times not long gone, German mercenaries, Hessians and others, were amongst the cruellest persecutors of Ireland. From a racial, religious or historical point of view, there is no affinity between Ireland and Germany. No Irishman can watch unmoved the heroic efforts of Frenchmen to defend the soil of their country. The Irish troops in France are glad when they find themselves fighting for the liberation of France. Lately there may have been prejudice against the French in Ireland, because French Governments foolishly and wickedly have persecuted the Catholic Church. The war, however, has changed all that. More than two thousand French priests have died upon the battle-field, and it is impossible to think of Irishmen ever being found amongst the enemies of France.

Ireland, too, has shared with all humanity the horror of those new methods of warfare inaugurated by Germany, which involve the destruction of the lives of defenceless women and children. There are few Irishmen who would not consider any advantage to Ireland too dearly bought if the price were alliance with the hordes who have been guilty of the infamies and atrocities perpetrated by Germany in the course of the war.

There may be differences of opinion as to whether the number of recruits from Ireland is or is not proportionately adequate. It cannot be denied, however, that Ireland's response deserved the description of it given by Lord Kitchener, when he declared it to be "magnificent." Even with the Irish Parliament in abeyance Ireland's response has been that. If the doors of the Irish Parliament were in fact open, the response of Ireland would be more "magnificent" still, and this it is which statesmen of all parties should realize. Had the Irish Parliament been open it is inconceivable that the tragedy of Easter, 1916, could have taken place in Dublin—it was the postponement of Home Rule which made that tragedy possible. In the course of the war the Irish troops have behaved with their accustomed valour. They have rendered a splendid service which should never be lost

A Plea and a Claim

sight of by Englishmen, who may from time to time be inclined to question the real attitude of Ireland. On the fields of France and Flanders the Orange troops from the north and the Catholics from the south have alike maintained the honour of their country. These men in the field have worked and fought side by side in brotherhood and amity. One may ask, in all seriousness, if this is not a sign that, under a fair and free system of government, the men of the north and south may not be trusted to work out in friendship the salvation of their common country.

The old system of government in Ireland is dead—no sane man believes it can ever be revived. Let it be the task of statesmen of all sections to devise a new system founded on freedom and possessing every reasonable safeguard for minorities. Let old prejudices be cast aside; let the hands which have been grasped upon the field of battle be grasped upon the fields of peace in Ireland also; let England trust fully and freely the people who have given so many brave soldiers to the common cause. In this way, and in this way alone, can Ireland, consistently with her national existence, become a loyal and true partner, ready to take her full place in peace and war with England and Scotland and all the great young nations of the Empire, so many of them her own children.

The reflections here set down are the very reflections which course through the minds of many thousands of Irish soldiers in Trench and Camp to-day; and of these things many and many an Irish soldier thought who will never think again in this world.

WILLIAM REDMOND.

THE BÉGUINES:

A STUDY IN THE VOCATIONS OF UNCLOISTERED WOMEN

THE Middle Ages, the Ages of Liberty, saw the people of Europe emerge from the shadow of Feudalism. Kings and feudal lords might still replenish their coffers by means of the great prices that merchants and traders were willing to pay for the charters of their towns; but within the chartered towns grew up the Trade Guilds; and in them the voice of the man who wrought grew ever more persistent until it gained freedom and power for workman and merchant alike.

Particularly was this so in the Netherlands, whence woollens and silks, woven and dyed by craftsmen who had learnt their trade in the East, found their way to all the markets of Europe. The Merchant Princes were at first supreme. Merchant Guilds, not Craft Guilds, ruled commercial life and established trade conditions. But by degrees the craftsman, originally unrepresented, then included in the guild as a silent member, then as an acclamative voice, finally stood forth with right to deliberate and to vote. No Trades-union of our own day is more democratic than those mediæval Trade Guilds, which, moreover, possessed a moral and religious force that no modern Trades-union can attain. For the Trade Guild was not an association, offensive and defensive, against the merchant; it was an association for the promotion of good workmanship and the encouragement and protection of good workmen, and it was caught up into that larger spirit of idealism which had burst the bonds of sloth and impiety and conventional religion, and was standing forth in the liberty wherewith the Workman of Nazareth had made all men free. The religious movement was itself democratic. It had originated with the people. Ecclesiastical authority was not responsible for it, and, indeed, scarcely knew how to deal with it, until

The Béguines

Pope Innocent III set forth to the world its significance in his famous sermon preached before the Fourth Lateran Council.

The Papacy had been engrossed in the battle for the Temporal Power against the Emperor. The Religious Orders were taken up with their internal affairs, the building of abbeys, the resistance to aggression, or their own spiritual and intellectual development. The Secular Canons had little connection with the people, and the Secular Clergy were so few that at Antwerp, in the time of the heretic Tanchelin, only two priests were to be found.* Therefore it is not primarily to official leaders that we must look for the origin of that great religious revival which the Pope was ready to recognize, and of which the Mendicant Orders and the Lay Associations are the visible and permanent sign and seal. It was coincident with the spread of mystical theology and the practical mysticism which it is difficult not to connect with Eastern influences, especially when we remember the Eastern monks with whom the Saracen Invasions had peopled Southern Italy, and under whose descendants Joachim of Flore had received his spiritual training. The Crusades, too, had brought the ordinary European into contact with the ascetic contemplatives and with the Basilian Monasteries of the Syrian desert; so that the militant West looked for a moment at God through the eyes of the mystic East. Indeed, the whole of Europe seemed to fall as it were suddenly under every kind of Eastern influence. Aristotle was read with the comment of the Spanish Moor; the mystical school of St. Victor of Paris was founded on the teaching of the pseudo-Dionysius and Plotinus, and not only the followers of St. Francis but people as far away from Southern Italy as Mechtilde of Magdeburg felt the spell of Joachim of Flore.

The people of Europe were in that receptive condition of soul that misfortune brings to states as well as to individuals. The Second and Third Crusades, one of

* *Annales de l'Académie Archéologique de Belgique*, xxiii, p. 374. Gens : *Histoire d'Anvers*, p. 36.

The Béguines

which had been preached and the other led by a Saint, had resulted in disaster. Europe was robbed of her manhood and her wealth. The weak were unprotected and oppressed; disease, unchained by want, stalked through the land. The whole of society was disintegrated by long war, and called aloud, as we in England may yet call aloud, for reconstruction. But in the Netherlands, where the trouble pressed hardest, it brought the means for its own cure. There the Crusades had left thousands of women unprovided for—"the land teemed with desolate women, the raw material for a host of neophytes"—with apparently no prospect but that of starvation or prostitution; for the houses of Secular Canonesses were only for women of noble birth; and, of the ordinary Religious Houses for women, Belgium had very few, nor would these receive dowerless maidens. But out of this decay came the principle of renewal; and what might have threatened a national disaster became a source of signal blessing.

For it was just at this crisis that a society of women arose who, while developing to the full the religious and mystical spirit of their age, took hold at the same time of the new industrial life of the country, and established for themselves and thousands of their sisters a position of economic independence hitherto unknown to the women of mediæval Europe. The birthplace of the new society was the city of Liège. That famous creation of the great Prince-Bishop Notger, "*Que Liège devait à Christ et à qui elle devait tout le reste*," stood proudly in a valley intersected by the canals which were the highways of her commerce, a monument of commercial and ecclesiastical aristocracy. On one side of the town lay the great houses of the merchant princes; on the other the streets still bear the names of the different crafts there practised, and round the cathedral and collegiate churches were the *domus claustrales* where lived the Secular Canons. Over the water-ways sounded the bells of the abbeys, and as the traveller approached the town from the hills the spires of seven collegiate and thirty parish churches met his eyes.

The Béguines

Among them, the great tower of St. Mary and St. Lambert rose so high that it seemed to the citizens to attract the snow from the peak of Mount St. Walburge, which it exceeded in height by at least twenty feet. Under its shadow slept St. Lambert, the patron of the diocese, guarding in death the city he had ruled in life, over whose chair in the chapel of the Holy Trinity hung the banner that Charlemagne was said to have given to the Liégeois.*

But Liège, though she rivalled the Eternal City herself in the many Masses that were said daily at her altars, was not free from the vices of her time. "In the days of Alberic," writes Jacques de Vitry,† "fervour began to decline. There were venal prebends; there were priests who laid aside the fear of God and reverence for their Order and, for avarice, did not fear to say Mass twice in the day. Citizens gave their daughters equally to clerics and laymen, and even thought they had more liberty espoused to clergy than to laymen." When Radulph succeeded Alberic, things grew even worse. He "not only permitted the error of his predecessor, but increased it. He caused the prebends to be sold in the market by a certain butcher called Udelinus, and all who wished to buy prebends came to him." Such was the city on which, in the middle of the Twelfth Century, a quickening wind stirred the living into more vigorous life. Far and wide the news spread, and was regarded with wonder by those best qualified to judge of its value. "For you found," says Jacques de Vitry to his friend Foulques, the Bishop of Toulouse, "in the lily-gardens of the Lord, many bands of virgins who for the love of Christ, spurning the snares of the flesh and despising the wealth of the world, for desire of the Kingdom of Heaven, in poverty and humility cleaving to their immortal Spouse, earned by the labours of their hands a frugal livelihood, and, though their parents had abundance, yet forgetting 'their own people and their father's house' preferred to bear the restraints

* Kurth: *Cité de Liège au Moyen Âge*, ii, 243 seq.

† *Vita B. Odill.*, *Analect*, Bolland, xiii, 206.

The Béguines

of poverty than to abound in ill-gotten wealth and to remain, at the risk of losing their salvation, amongst the proud and pompous of the world. . . . You saw with exultation holy matrons serving God, and watching and guarding with zeal the purity of girls and confirming them in the way set before them. You saw widows serving God in fasts and prayers and watches, in tears and the labours of their hands. You saw, and rejoiced to see, holy women serving God in the married state, bringing up their children in the fear of God, keeping the marriage-bond, and having time for prayer. You saw many, with their husbands' consent, abstaining from lawful pleasure, living in continence, and leading an angelic life.”*

With this outburst of religious fervour was very closely connected Lambert le Bègue, a certain priest of the city, whose nickname points to some defect in his speech, not, however, sufficiently serious to interfere with his power as a preacher. Lambert was a reformer. He attacked the evils of the town and the desecration of the Sunday feast by drinking and dicing; the low mimes and dancing women; the expiation of sins by long pilgrimages instead of by restitution and alms-giving; the vices of his brethren, their simony, lust and neglect of duty.† Lambert seems to have been an especial friend of the craftsmen, for his enemies were fond of declaring that he preached to “tanners and weavers,” and that “none of the chief men of the city” were to be found in his little church of St. Christopher in the suburb of Avroy; “as though, forsooth,” he remarks, “it were a crime to practise the arts necessary for human life.”

The writer of the *Fasti Ordinis Cisterciensis* says that by the side of his church Lambert built a house for himself and for some Order of men, and that round about there grew up other little houses, where “many noble virgins and honourable widows” established themselves, to be near the church whence they drew courage and inspiration for their great venture. At first these noble

* Bolland, *A.S.S.*, June, iv, 630. † *Analect*, Bolland, xiii, p. 201 seq.

The Béguines

virgins and honourable widows were known to their friends as *mulieres devotæ* or *virgines continentes*; but their enemies in the city of Liège, who were also the enemies of Lambert le Bêgue, soon found for them a nickname: "Béguines, the followers of the Stammerer." The name caught the popular fancy. At first, while a cloud still hung over their master, the name, if it was used by their friends, bore a qualification: "*Beguines ut dicuntur*" we constantly read. But when Lambert's enemies had done their worst, when all their charges had been refuted at Rome, and the name of Le Bêgue had become a glory to Liège, his followers shared in his fame as they had shared in his disgrace. The *ut dicuntur* disappears, and the *mulieres devotæ* are boldly called Béguines. Lambert died in 1187, on his way back from Rome, after his vindication by the Pope from the accusations of his enemies. Very soon after his death there were four other Béguinages in Liège, those of St. Madeleine, St. Martin, St. Adalbert and St. Abraham.

Though we first hear of the Béguines at Liège, they arose almost simultaneously in all the important towns of the Netherlands, notably at Nivelles, where the Dominican Thomas of Cantimpré speaks of a house of "the devout women called Béguines, who are spread over all the world." They were not "nuns," they took no vows, they retained any property they might possess, or, lacking property, negotiated their labour within or without their cabins, and could merge into a world they had not really renounced and marry at discretion. Nivelles was the birthplace of one of the earliest of the Béguines, Marie d'Oignies. She had been attracted when but a child to the idea of a life of Religion by the Cistercian monks who used to visit her father's house. There was, from the first, a very strong sympathy between the Cistercians and the Béguines, probably because both had realized the same truth and were trying to translate it into the terms of everyday life: that prayer must be made real by work and work made holy by prayer. Marie, however, was not allowed to be a nun. Her

The Béguines

parents had other views for her; and, soon after her fourteenth year, she was married. But it was not long before she and her husband agreed to separate; and Marie, after some months spent in nursing the lepers, went to live as a Béguine in the city of Liége, where (though she and her husband had abundant means) she earned her living by the labours of her hands. She lived a life of high contemplation. The Saints were her dear and familiar friends. She walked and talked with them, and there was between her and them the sympathy of mutual understanding. One evening, in the church of a little town where she was a stranger, she became aware of the company of one of her saintly friends. No notice had been given of a Feast, nor were the bells ringing as was the custom on the eve of a Saint's Day. But Marie was so sure that some Saint had come to keep festival that she went and rang the bells herself, greatly to the surprise of the priest, who came hurrying to see what was happening. "Pardon me, Father," said Marie, "I ring because to-morrow is some Saint's Day. I do not know what Saint, but I feel the church all filled with joy." And the priest, looking at his Breviary, saw that the next day was a feast of St. Gertrude, the Gertrude of revealings. When Marie's death drew near, her joy knew no bounds. It seemed to her that one of the Seraphs had his wing stretched over her breast. She began to sing, and ceased not for three days and nights. At last, towards the morning of the third day, her voice failed for weariness, whereat the Prior of the Convent church, to which she had been carried and where she lay awaiting her summons, rejoiced; for he feared that the people coming to the church in the morning might think her mad. But on the next morning she began again. Then the Prior locked the church door, so that he and she were there alone. She sang of the ineffable nature of God, of the Most Blessed Trinity in Unity, of all the Saints, of Angels and Archangels and Apostles. She had the gift of prophecy also, and sang of what should be hereafter in the Church, and especially she rejoiced because the

The Béguines

Holy Spirit was about to spread abroad His work, by the Order of Preachers still to be founded. And in great joy she died.

Less than sixty years after the death of Lambert we find Béguinages at Ghent, Brussels, Ypres, Lille, Ardenbourg, Ardenne, Courtrai, Chistelle, Aloest and Termonde. By the middle of the Thirteenth Century there was scarcely a town in the Netherlands without one. They soon spread to France and Germany. St. Louis founded at least one near Paris, and Philip de Montmorail established in various places "as many as five thousand Béguines." In 1243 Matthew Paris writes: "The people called Béguines have increased to thousands and thousands. These women profess chastity and support themselves by the labours of their hands." And in 1250 he says again: "At this time a great multitude, chiefly of women, arose in Germany, and assuming the dress and habits of Religious called themselves Béguins or Béguines. The number of them increased so rapidly that in Cologne alone many thousands were found." This mighty growth had taken place in various ways. Sometimes, as at Liège or Nivelles, the women, uplifted by a great tide of fervour, had grouped themselves around some priest like Lambert, or the shrine of some Saint like St. Gertrude, and the Béguinage had developed almost spontaneously without outside interference. More often, though the Béguines existed, the Béguinage had to be founded. At Diest, for instance, there was "for a long time a small band of Béguines in divers parishes." But as from this arrangement "they suffered divers inconveniences and much damage to their souls, Arnold Lord of Diest in 1250 bought a certain parcel of ground from the Abbot and Chapter of St. Trudo with the consent of Henry of Liège, and granted the Béguines the faculty of building a church there."* At Bruges, Johanna and Margaret, Countesses of Flanders, founded the Béguinage, and Johanna lived there for a time.† It still stands, a quadrangle of stiff little houses around a central green; on one side is the

* Cf. Miræus Op., *Diplom. Hist.*, i, 768.

The Béguines

chapel that Margaret of Flanders transferred thither from the Castle of Bruges, with the ornaments and books thereto belonging. At Valenciennes, the Béguines "lived in divers places" until, in 1239, Guido, Bishop of Cambrai, besought Radulph, Prior of the Dominican House of St. Salvius by Valenciennes, to give them some place in the parish of St. Nicholas, which was in his patronage, "in which they might build themselves a House with a Chapel and a Cloister." The Béguines were not at this time all expected to live in the "Cloister," for the Bishop orders that the Chaplain who serves the House "shall minister the Sacraments to all other Religious Women called Béguines living in their own houses."

These were the early days of liberty, enthusiasm and development. It was then that St. Juliana, persecuted for righteousness' sake, went forth from her Convent with a little company of Béguines. In the years of toil and privation that followed, the vision that had filled her cell at Mount Corneillon spread through the world. It fired the soul of the great Dominican and drew from his lips the song whose strains still fill the Church on the Feast of Corpus Christi. It reached the Eternal City and called forth from the Vicar of Christ the decree which completed the circle of the Church's festivals. We owe the *Pange Lingua Gloriosi* to St. Thomas, but to that little company of persecuted Béguines we owe the very Feast itself.

Another Béguine helped, most probably, to shape the dreams of the great Poet of vision himself. Mechtilde of Magdeburg was born about 1212. While she was yet a child God claimed her for His own, by what she calls the "Salutation of the Holy Ghost." At twenty-three, desiring to serve God in poverty and loneliness and "reproach which she had not earned by her sins," she went to Magdeburg. Without dowry or recommendation no Religious Order would take her, and she became a Béguine. Her life of toil (for she earned a hard, poor livelihood, and yet found time to nurse the sick and to be gay with them, and "to smile when she felt least inclined")

The Béguines

was crowned after fifteen years of prayer and penance by a state of mystic union with God, in which she saw as in a mirror the secrets of His dealings with His Church and with her own soul. Mechtild was by nature a poetess, and even when she does not actually write in verse, her words are the winged words of a mistress of vision. Dante, if Mechtild was indeed the Lady whom he saw gathering flowers in the Earthly Paradise, must have read her treatise, the *Flowing Light of the Godhead*, in the Latin version made by Henry of Halle, her Dominican director.* The last fifteen years of her life were spent in the famous Benedictine Cloister of Helfta. There she would live in intimate friendship with the younger Mechtild of Hackeborn and the Abbess Gertrude, and would watch and foster the spiritual growth of the great St. Gertrude, then a child of but nine years.

To the example and inspiration of the Béguines during this time the Beghards owed their existence. During the Sixteenth Century an attempt was made to connect their foundation with Bega, the daughter of Pippin; but the earliest Community of Beghards of which there is any authentic record is that of Louvain, which was founded in 1220. The Rules of the Beghards were identical with those of the Béguines. The Beghards were at first weavers for the most part, afterwards copyists of manuscripts. They were practically a Religious Community of craftsmen, living a common life, bound by no vows and, like the Béguines, free to leave at will. Many of them were weak or sickly, says Gramaye, and found the common life and common work a great strength and protection. Their existence was more precarious than that of their sisters, for they excited the jealousy of the Trade Guilds by their exemption from imposts, and fell rightly or wrongly under suspicion from ecclesiastical authority. For one reason and another they were never received so unreservedly into favour as the Béguines, who, though they came into being without

* *Revelationes Gertrudianæ et Mechilidianæ*. Solesmes, Ed. Vol. ii; cf. Edmund Gardner, *Dante and Mysticism*, and *Dante, Purg.*, xxviii, 34 seq.

The Béguines

sanction formally asked or given by the Holy See, had no lack of Papal recognition and ecclesiastical patronage. In 1261 Pope Urban IV took the Béguines of Liège under his special protection, and Innocent IV did the same for those of Diest, Malines and Brussels.* Indulgences were granted by Popes and Papal Legates to those who gave them help or showed them kindness. The civil power followed the example of the spiritual leaders. Emperors, kings and nobles granted them charters and lands, freedom from taxation, and the privileges of Religious. All this was, however, to their undoing. So long as the Béguines remained Lay Associations, so long they retained their freedom; but when they began to be recognized as Religious, and were perforce treated as such, their freedom and individuality dwindled away. The reason is obvious. The Béguine Rule was something that had grown out of the Béguine life. The Béguines could no more develop the Benedictine Rule than the lark can put on the colours of the jay.

Every religious effort is the result of some living idea. The idea of the Béguine life was of a social life lived in common with the struggling mass of humanity united to a spiritual life lived on the mountain-tops of prayer and contemplation. It was the life of the Galilean Carpenter, whose days of earthly toil were crowned by hours of communion with His Father on the flower-strewn slopes of the hills above Nazareth. This characteristic liberty of the Béguines was lost by slow degrees. First they must all live within the Béguinage. Then they must all wear the Béguine dress. Then they must not go out without a companion. Thus gradually the bonds were drawn tighter till the Béguine was as closely confined in her Béguinage as a nun in her cloister; always, however, with this difference—the Béguinage was a convent with an ever-open door. Any Béguine was free to leave it when she chose, "free to love and free to wander," free to enter a Religious Order. While she remained in the Béguinage she was not only allowed, but expected, to work for her

* Miræus, *Hist. Diplom.*, i, 429.

The Béguines

living, or to engage in good works outside its walls. Within, the Béguines spun and wove. In some cases, as at Ghent, they baked bread for the townsfolk. They tended lepers and nursed the sick, and they did the last offices for the dying and the dead. Had they lived to-day they must have had opened to their charity a round of duty as domestic helpers in homes—a duty which Cardinal Manning, in his dreams, saw even the priest of the future fulfil.

In appearance the Béguinage was like a compact village surrounded by a wall. Generally there was only one gate, and sometimes the whole settlement was protected by a ditch and a drawbridge. In earlier times it was usually built just outside the city walls. The larger ones consisted of streets laid out in straight lines; in smaller ones the houses were often built around a central green. Beside the small houses there were convents for the younger Béguines and for the pupils, at least one church and a few cells for recluses. One of the largest Béguinages was that called the Great Béguinage, close to the Brugger Gate at Ghent; it contained two churches, eighteen convents and four hundred small houses. Unfortunately this Béguinage was closed in the Eighteenth Century, by the municipal authorities, in order that a road might be made through it. The existing great Béguinage, in Mont St. Amand, is a modern construction after the model of the old one.

In the Cartulary of St. Elizabeth of Ghent is a document which gives an interesting description of the organization and mode of life and work at that particular Béguinage:

Among these establishments (the Béguinages) they founded one called the Curia of St. Elizabeth, which is surrounded on all sides by walls and ditches. In the midst is the church, and beside it the hospital. . . . There are in it many houses which are arranged for the habitation of the said women, of which each is separated from the other by walls and ditches, and has its own entrance. There are two chaplains maintained by them. In those houses many are so poor that they have nothing but their bed and chest

The Béguines

of clothes, but they are burdensome to none, but by working with their hands . . . they earn every day so much that they not only earn a modest livelihood but they obey the law of the Church and from that little they give alms. In the Convent one is called the Mistress of Works, whose business it is to superintend works and workers so that all is done faithfully according to the Will of God. In working they have a certain rule that rising early they meet at the church, each in her own place, so that the absence of any can be detected ; and when they have heard Mass and each has said her own prayers, they return to their own houses and work in silence all day so that they never cease from prayer ; or they say the psalms, the Miserere or other psalms which they know. Late in the evening after Vespers, when they have leisure for prayer and meditation, they go again to the church and thereafter go to rest. They frequently fast on bread and water, they use no linen next their skin, and sleep on beds laid on the floor. And with all this they are so circumspect in their manners and so learned in household things, that great and honourable people send their daughters to them to be brought up, hoping that to whatever state of life they are afterwards called, whether of religion or of marriage, they would be found better prepared than others. . . . Their habit is of grey, simple in make with nothing remarkable in any of its details.*

With this description of Béguinage life in the Fourteenth Century it is interesting to compare an account we have of the Béguinage of Tournai in 1520. The Béguines of Tournai had, it seems, refused lawful obedience to their Grand Mistress, owing to the evil influence of a certain sister, Jacque de Gand, who had hoped to be elected Grand Mistress herself. After many exhortations, none of which had any effect, Jacque de Gand was expelled from the Béguinage by the parish priest, who had been appointed by the Bishop of Tournai to represent him in spiritualities. Thereupon she brought an action against him before the Provost of the town. The opening words of the case for the defendant are as follows :

There is in the town of Tournai a very fair place called the Grand Béguinage, which is closed and shut by gates as well as

* Published by P. Fredericq in *Corpus Documentorum Inquisitionis Neerlandae*, i, 176.

The Béguines

walls, like a Cloister of Canons. In this place there is a very fair church where the canonical hours are sung and divine service celebrated by Chaplains appointed of great antiquity. And there is moreover a fair hospital and fitting to receive poor Béguines, weak, impotent, and sick. Also there are in the said Béguinage many Béguines good and honourable, living there in all honour, wearing the habit of the Béguines, having for headdress a great white kerchief with which they are well covered. . . . Also in the said Cloister there are particular mansions where the Béguines have their dwelling and habitation, with little gardens for their recreation. Also in the said Béguinage there is a Mistress who is elected by all the said Béguines . . . and whose election is confirmed by Monseigneur the Bishop of Tournai, who is their sovereign and superintendent in all that concerns their spirituality. To the said Mistress thus elected and confirmed owe the aforesaid Béguines honour and obedience, and none should go out of the Cloister of the said Béguinage without the leave of the Mistress nor without the companion which the said Mistress orders her. The Béguines in the Béguinage have neither vows nor promises of Religion except so far and so long as they wish to dwell in the Béguinage, and to take there the benefits ordained by the founders they will keep the enclosure, live an honourable life and obey the Mistress.*

The rest of the story is sad. In the Béguinage of Tournai, which had been "so filled with holy maidens that there was no other place where so peaceful and gracious a life was lived," where every one wished "to place their young daughters that they might be taught and educated," great scandal arose, and many pages are filled with the story of its disputes. Perhaps an example of the evil effects of enclosure and chaperonage grafted on the original simplicity of the Béguine Rule.

But the Béguine spirit showed itself not only in individual and corporate freedom, but also in freedom of association with other religious communities. It is the tendency of Religious Orders to stand in close companies, distinct from each other. But the Béguines are in contact with all the other Lay Associations in which the

* *Compte-rendu des Séances de la Commission Royale d'Histoire. Bruxelles, 1888.*

The Béguines

democratic spirit of the Middle Ages expressed itself. Known all over Europe by their devotion to works of penance, they were constantly identified with the orders of Penitents ; the more so as their Directors were chiefly Franciscan and Dominican Friars. Béguinages were often established near Dominican Convents, as at Strasburg, Cologne and Valenciennes.

Very close, too, was their connection with the Göttesfreunde, that remarkable association comprised of priests and laymen, in which an Echhart, or a Suso, or a Ruysbroeck was on equal terms with merchants, bankers and tradesmen ; in which only holiness counted, and rank, either ecclesiastical or civil, went for nothing. The Friends of God included in their fellowship all who strove after righteousness, and among them many Beguines. It was a Béguine, Sister Lutgarde, who, as a result of many visions, founded for the Friends of God the Franciscan Convent of Wittichen near Schillach in the Black Forest. In the Béguine community of the Waldschwester in Switzerland were to be found Göttesfreunde. One of them, Margaret of the Golden Ring, gave to the Library *The Flowing Light of the Godhead*, given her by her friend and Director, Henry of Nördlingen the Dominican, also one of the Göttesfreunde. The first house established by the Brethren of Common Life was a Béguinage. After his conversion Gerard Groote gave up his house " for the use of those poor who wish to devote themselves to the service of Christ." He kept one room for himself, where he lived.

" My intention is," he said, " not in any way to found a new Religious Order or a new Religion, but simply to offer hospitality to women who seek a place of retreat to worship God in humility and penitence. These women shall be bound by no vows, nor attached to any order, nor distinguished by any ecclesiastical habit, but they shall remain and be called lay-folk and shall be clothed in a dark colour like other honest women of the city. If any of the Sisters (or Béguines) begs outside or brings money into her house she shall be at once expelled, for it is by the work of their hands that they must all provide what is necessary to the common life."

The Béguines

So closely were Beghards and Béguines joined with the many Religious Lay Associations of Europe that their name became a synonym for men and women living a holy life in the world. Franciscan and Dominican Tertiaries, Alexians, Humiliati, Göttesfreunde, were all popularly known as Béguines. But they were pre-eminently associations of mystics. The mystical life is a great adventure, full of romance. Like their Brethren in all time these Béguine mystics roamed through a world more full of awe and wonder than any poet imagined in his rapturous dreaming. They heard sounds and saw sights and knew pleasures beside which the sights and sounds and pleasures of earth are faint and cold. And for adventure they cast themselves from the edge of the world of sense into illimitable space, knowing that underneath them were the Everlasting Arms.

And these knights of high adventure, these voluptuaries of heavenly delights, who were they? German tradesmen and bankers, Flemish weavers, Dutch serving-maids, nuns driven forth from their convents for desiring more holiness than their fellows found convenient, Mendicant Friars, and pale students bowed and blind with bending over their books. Not only children of the Romance nations; they came also of the slow German stock, and of the same race as those Flanders merchants whose practicality made their trade the most prosperous in Europe. But all had seen the vision of the King in His Beauty in the Land of Far Distances. All were one in a common secret. All had left the safe green pastures where the sheep were feeding, and climbed the steep mountain-sides towards the shining peaks where lay the Land of their vision.

Some, indeed, had been happier had they been content with the green pastures. For the mountain heights were slippery, and their senses were intoxicated with the mountain air. Then one would slip, and the mystic became the heretic. Some, like Nicholas of Basle and Margaret Porrette, paid for their lapses with their lives. Others climbed again to safe paths with hands and feet torn by the rocks, and eyes blinded with tears. But

The Béguines

between the false and the true, men had often neither the wit nor the knowledge to distinguish. Hence all Béguines became identified with the heresies into which some had fallen. This was the more possible because members of heretical sects and persons of evil life adopted the dress and the name of Beghards and Béguines to enable them to propagate more easily their teaching or to indulge their baseness without arousing suspicion.* Such was a common device of the Cathari and the Brethren of the Free Spirit. Others, too, calling themselves Béguines, went about begging; and the cry, "Bread, bread, for God's sake!"† brought popular discredit on an Order whose rule of working with their hands no true Béguine ever broke. And not only did this parasitic growth rouse the populace against the Béguines, but it also embroiled them with the ecclesiastical authorities; and the state of affairs grew so serious that, after many letters, proclamations and prohibitions, Clement V, at the Council of Vienne, issued a Bull suppressing the Beghards and Béguines.‡

For the Beghards, though they survived till the close of the century, this was the beginning of the end; but the Béguines, even after the edict, lived on in spite of repressions which deprived them of home and property, and placed their very lives in jeopardy. But John XXII, to whose hearing it had come "that there were many women called Béguines who, pursuing the way of virtue, act honourably, obey the Bishop, do not entangle themselves in dispute and error, but live in holy simplicity, some in their own houses, others in the houses of their relations, and others in the common houses of the said Béguinage for the better observance of chastity," commanded the Bishops to observe that such should be excluded from his predecessor's edict and protected from further persecution. Under Pope Urban V trouble again broke out, and not until the pontificate of Eugenius IV had the Béguines rest. Henceforth the reins of authority

* See *Vita B. Odili*, *Analect.*, Bolland, xxii, *supra*.

† *Mansi*, xxiii, p. 998. Cf. Giesler, *Hist.*, iv, 220 *seq.* ‡ *Mansi*, xxv, 418 *seq.*

The Béguines

were drawn tighter, rules of dress and residence in the Béguinages were applied more strictly, and pressure was put on the Béguines to observe the rules of the Franciscan Tertiaries. The greater number, however, continued to live according to their own Rules. They survived the Reformation and the French Revolution, with its secularization of Religious Houses, and have persisted to our own days, some of their buildings serving as hospitals or charitable institutions.

The story of the Béguinage of Mons is interesting. Founded in the Thirteenth Century, it was placed under the control of the Chapter of St. Waldetrude, which consisted of Canonesses as well as Canons. In 1356 one of the Béguines left her house as a Hostel for the training of nine poor girls as nursing nuns. But the Canonesses of St. Waldetrude, thinking this an infringement of their rights in the Béguinage, suppressed the will until 1378. Then the bequest was carried out on condition that if the supply of nursing nuns failed the Hostel should revert to the Béguinage. But the supply was constantly maintained. The nuns lived under a rule of poverty and obedience, and nursed the hospital of Cantimpré, a suburb of Mons, where the Béguinage was situated. They continued until the Revolution, when the hospital was suppressed for a few weeks, but revived again as a public institution. The Béguines of Mons, in 1488, adopted the Rule of St. Augustine; but the Canonesses, again thinking their rights infringed, turned them out of the Béguinage, whereupon they went in procession with great pomp to another dwelling. As to the Béguinage, it eventually became an almshouse for the servants of the Grand Mistress, the only Béguine left. She kept four maids; and, when they grew past work, placed them in the infirmary as pensioners; for according to the Rule only old or sick Béguines could be received into the infirmary of a Béguinage. It is as an almshouse that the Béguinage of Mons exists to-day.*

* Cf. F. Hachez, *Le Béguinage de Mons: Le Messager des Sciences Historiques de Belgique*, 1849.

The Béguines

The essential element of all renewal and of all reconstruction is the vision of Truth. Vision is the soul of a community ; out of the Vision grows the life, as a man's soul shapes his body ; and the life is the source of all construction and reconstruction. To attempt to reconstruct the social order of a nation that has lost the Vision would be to make a rule of life for a corpse. But for the nation or society that has still the Vision there is no death. The Pope might bid the Company of Jesus lie down and die ; but no Papal mandate could suppress the living soul which animated it. The rivers of blood which deluged France at the Revolution could not drown the living spirit of the Religious Orders.

The unholy rites wherewith the three Great Powers celebrated the "Sacrament of Evil" over what they deemed to be the lifeless body of Poland have left her still a nation. "Fear not those that kill the body," has been written over the official tombs of many a slaughtered nation and persecuted society—whose souls still live with God. For, sooner or later, they step forth from the grave-clothes, and the stone is rolled away, and they come forth in the power of a more vigorous life.

The Vision must come first. But history can point to the ways in which, after great upheavals, such as ours to-day, renewal has followed close. In Belgium, after the Crusades, it grew out of the visions of mystics crystallized into prayer and work—prayer which strengthened their hold on Truth, and work which made it real to the people. For many of our countrymen prayer is a lost art, and the gospel of work, often as it has been preached, remains in the letter. Men have lost the knowledge that it is the highest vocation of men—partnership with God in creation. Our forefathers of the mediæval Trade Guilds had this knowledge, and expressed it, not only in Abbeys and Cathedrals, but in houses and furniture and in the common things of daily life. With the Reformation in England came all that we now connect with labour troubles—the factory system, conscienceless Capitalism, and equally conscienceless Trades-unionism. There is

The Béguines

no Vision : all is darkness and confusion. The Catholic Church alone can restore it to the blind and struggling world. She can tell it of the life of the Béguines, who, toiling among the multitudes at the foot of the Mount, soared in spirit to the Glory on its summit. She can remind it of One who toiled in a carpenter's shop at Nazareth or walked the hills of Galilee alike in the light of the Beatific Vision.

There is an Order of Women living almost in secret amongst us the hidden life of Nazareth, the active life of those who follow Him Who went about doing good. They know London in the west and in the south ; they know, but, except as doers of good, they are not known. That is well to understand. But what we need now, and shall need more than ever when the war is over and valiant women are released from their devoted labours, are Societies who will make the hidden life manifest by living it amongst the people—working and praying by their side. So might the world of Labour see with the Catholic Church the Blessed Vision which is her own light and glory.

GERTRUDE ROBINSON.

THE COUNCIL *of* TRENT AND ATTENDANCE AT ANGLICAN SERVICE

THE earliest Catholic legislation against Elizabeth's religious changes was the "Declaration" or "Resolution" issued by a Congregation of the Council of Trent. Some records thereon have of late been found and published by Mr. C. G. Bayne, in his *Anglo-Roman Relations, 1558-1565*.^{*} Good as his commentary is, it has its shortcomings; and in any case the story should be told somewhere with a Catholic perspective. The change of religion in England had been effected, so far as Parliament was concerned, mainly by two Acts (1559). The *Act of Supremacy* established a State Church, with Elizabeth as its Supreme Governess, while the *Act of Uniformity* authorised the Anglican service, broadly speaking as we now know it; its chief prayers taken from the old Missal, and its defects consisting rather in omissions than in commissions. Nevertheless, those who attended this service, the prayers of which were not explicitly heretical, rarely came away without having to listen to a sermon, which might be, and generally was, a strong attack on the Old Faith. In any case they were at service with Protestants to whom the omissions from the Catholic rite were intentional and significant. Indeed, if excisions in Catholic Liturgy are tolerated, the rite can be made to support almost any error.

The Protestantizing of the country was caused by coercing the people to attend this ensnaring service. Many in those days were extraordinarily submissive, and demoralized "by the false persuasion that it was enough to hold the Faith interiorly, while obeying the Sovereign

^{*} This is the second volume of *Oxford Historical and Literary Studies*. I should also refer to the late Dr. Maitland, on the same subject, in the *English Historical Review* (Vol. XV) or in his *Collected Papers*.

The Council of Trent

in externals.”* On the other hand the Tudor tyranny was extraordinarily effective. The Bishops, Convocation, the Universities and the Church at large, made strong protests, while free. But these were immediately followed (in the summer and autumn of 1559) by ignoble submissions, as soon as force was applied. The Bishops indeed stood firm; but the clergy collapsed in a general apostasy. According to the most favourable of modern Catholic critics, three-quarters of the clergy not only fell at once, but were actually forced to carry on the war against the Church by reciting the new service to their flocks on Sundays! This is perhaps the worst defection that ever befell the Catholic Church. It was to provide remedies for calamities such as these that the Council of Trent reopened its sessions on January 18th, 1562: and by the June following some Catholic gentlemen had resolved to lay before the Council their troubles under the new laws.†

So grave was the peril of the petitioners that they did not dare to write openly. In its present state their letter bears no address, no name of writer, or place of writing, or date. Our Roman text indeed proves that it reached the hands of the Legates at Trent on August 2nd, 1562, having been given to them by Fernando Martinez Mascarenas, the Ambassador of Portugal at the Council, in which he played an important part.‡ Mascarenas had made his name in the Portuguese colonies, and had then been Ambassador at Rome. It is therefore possible that his name was known in England, and that the English Catholics already mentioned applied to him directly. If,

* So Dr. Allen in 1578 (*Letters*, p. 56; translation in *Douay Diaries*). The whole passage is important.

† A copy of this *Petition to Trent* was sent to Rome, August 2nd, 1562, by the Legates. See Susta, *Die Roemische Curie und das Concil von Trient unter Pius IV*, 1909. The Vatican reference is Concil. Trid. v. 151, fol. 123. Father Garnet, *see below*, printed the petition with the answer in 1600. Mr. Bayne prints from the Roman Transcripts at the Record Office.


‡ Mascarenas. The name is sometimes found as Marescenas, with variant spellings, Mascharenas, Mascareynhas, etc. Don Pedro de Mascarenas was ambassador at Rome twenty-five years earlier, and figures much in the lives of the first Jesuits.

The Council of Trent and

however, there was a Portuguese Ambassador or agent in England (but this is not yet certain), the communication may well have been made through him. Those who handed in the letter to the Council are indicated in the answer as "N—— and C——" A late tradition gives the honour of being bearer to Father Thomas Darbshire, afterwards a Jesuit; but we have no contemporary evidence to test further or to explain these apparently diverging statements.*

We must next study with care the case sent from England. The writer says that a punishment was inflicted for non-attendance at church on Sundays; but he does not say what the penalty was, though he wishes to represent the circumstances of Catholics as grave. In point of fact, however, the fine was not grave, only one of a shilling each Sunday. Still this does not justify Dr. Maitland in making light of the penalty. The sum was not a small one for the poor and for servants; and there was also (surviving from the time of Edward VI, it is said) the penalty of excommunication, which somehow put the sufferer outside the protection of the law. The effect of these annoying punishments was extremely displeasing to the Catholics, the high conservatives of that day;† for they were thereby brought into conflict with the Crown, while the despised new men acquired power to humble and harry them. The Catholic party was

* Thomas Darbshire, once Chancellor of the Diocese of London, and Dean of St. Paul's, having gone into exile, went on to Trent in 1563, where he was received for the Society by Laynez, and being sent on to Rome entered the novitiate, May 1st, 1563. The question is, did he make a previous journey to Trent in June-September, 1562, bringing the letter of the English and returning with the answer. This is affirmed by Father Matthias Tanner in his *Societas Jesu Apostolorum Imiatrix* (1694); but I cannot find any contemporary authority for it. I can find no reference to his visit in the published correspondence of Laynez, of Salmeron, or of Canisius (the correspondence of the two first are in the *Monumenta Historica Soc. Jesu*; the latter is edited by Braunsberger), who were all at Trent. No mention in Darbshire's eulogy in the *Annual Letters* for 1604 (under Pontamussou), nor in More's History, 1660, nor in Sotvellus, *Catalogus Primorum Patrum*, 1640.

† "If it is allowed, without danger to the soul or offence of God, to obey the public law of the Kingdom, they would like to do so. . . . This question exercises and disturbs many pious and religious consciences."—*Petition to Trent*. 

Attendance at Anglican Service

depressed and incapable of action. The misery of their position was by no means to be measured by punishments legally in force against them. The Tudor tyrants were always *finding treason*, even in quite innocent actions—and much more if those acts were forbidden (though not as treason) by one of their new-fangled laws. This had been shown by Cecil during the excitement which had followed the mission of Martinengo (April, 1561). A nervous priest, John Devon or Coxe, had been arrested, and, scared by his misfortune, had confessed the names of those for whom he had said Mass. They, being arrested, were in turn constrained to charge others, until in July over a hundred Catholics were in the persecutor's hands, and at their head Sir Thomas Wharton, one of the late Queen's Councillors. The number being large, Cecil persuaded Elizabeth "to believe that there must be a conspiracy":* and thereupon all the procedure was changed for that against treason. Heavy fines were now exacted, some were in prison for many months, many forced to take the oath of Supremacy; one, at least, the future martyr Wodehouse, once chaplain to Queen Mary, was never freed again. If such proceedings were *legitimate*, then the severest measures, including the death penalty, were already in force under the new government, though they were not yet actually on the statute book.

It was high-handed measures such as these, which brought home to the unfortunate Catholics what the real nature was of the tyranny under which they lived; and if we seek to discover the occasion of the letter sent to Trent in June, we shall probably be near the true cause, when we note from the Spanish Ambassador's dispatch of June 6th of that year, 1562, that Mr. George Chamberlain, a Catholic and a friend of Lord Montague, had just then been imprisoned in the Tower. Did this portend a recrudescence of persecution?

Such being the fears and uncertainties of the Catholic gentry, in June, they turn to Mascarenas, at Trent, and

* De Quadra to Granville, April 21st, 1561: "La Reyna cree que sea conjura y conspiracion contra ella."—Lettenhove, *Relations Politiques*.

The Council of Trent and

speak (§ 4) of the "great brightness of hope," expected through his help. What can that mean? Of course the phrase is too short and vague to be explained with certainty now. The probability, however, seems to be that it arose out of the "balance" policy of Catharine of Medici. In order to keep the decisive power in her own hands, she was then raising up the Huguenots in France, to depress the Catholics; and her courtiers were encouraging talk of adopting through a national council (or perhaps even through the Council of Trent) the formula of the Anglican Church for the French Church Service, instead of that of Rome. Even the Cardinal of Lorraine was rumoured to be in favour of this. Such talk went on until the outbreak of a new war of religion in France, April till July, 1562.* Cool and well-informed persons ought never to have been misled into believing such rumours: but we cannot wonder if prisoners and sufferers caught at such hopes of freedom and relief as the reports held out. If, as was represented, a great Catholic power had a chance of obtaining the Anglican formulary from the Council, why might not English prisoners try to free themselves from grievous persecution by obtaining some sort of compromise on the same subject? Might they not perhaps go to Service, under protest that they only went as a sign of their obedience to the Queen? No question is raised about receiving the Anglican Sacrament: it is only a question of bare external presence, to avoid consequences which might be most severe. They do not ask for this directly, they know that there will be difficulty, they have refused to go to Service before, and they will refuse again, if the Council thinks that obedience to these laws cannot be licit.

Such was the petition put into the hands of the Legates on August 2nd. They at once sent up a copy (our copy) to the Pope; and, after this, nothing more is heard about the matter in their official correspondence. Nor was there any reason why it should be mentioned again there. A public discussion or decree had been deprecated; and

* *Foreign Calendar*, 1561, 1562.

Attendance at Anglican Service

the busy *conciliarii* were doubtless quite glad to be free from the duty. What had been asked for was the opinion of "the most pious and learned theologians," and it seems most likely that the Legates engaged or allowed Mascarenas to get the necessary men together. At all events, a fair-sized "congregation" was assembled, containing several of the most respected names at Trent, while at the same time Portugal had a preponderance. Cardinal Hosius became President, and this was the more appropriate, because he acted as representative of the North Europe Catholics; moreover he had Bishop Goldwell and Nicholas Sander in his suite. The Vice-President was the Venerable Bartolomeo de los Martyres, the well-known Archbishop of Braga, a Dominican, whose reputation both for sanctity and learning is still so high that the cause of his Beatification was introduced under Pope Pius IX.

Then there was yet another Archbishop, an Italian, whose see was Lanciano; and there were two more Bishops, both Portuguese, of Coimbra and of Leria respectively. There was also Father Laynez, General of the Jesuits, and the first two among the theologians of the Pope—Peter de Soto, O.P., and Alphonso Salmeron, S.J.; finally there were all the four Theologians sent by Portugal. Out of the total of twelve,* seven were Portuguese, Spaniards three, one Italian, one a German Pole, namely, the presiding Cardinal. Four were Dominicans, two Jesuits, two Augustinians; while the President and three doctors represented the secular clergy. The remark made about Friar Peter de Soto, that he was known in England both by name and face, shows that the principle was not forgotten, that some intimate friend of England should be on the board. Otherwise one would have expected Bishop Goldwell or Dr. Sander to have been on it. Perhaps there were special reasons

* Garnet, in his preface, mentions: "The president and eleven other Prelates and Fathers." But by an evident mispunctuation the number is raised to fourteen in a quotation printed by Bayne, where we read of "Hosius, Soto and the other twelve divines, etc.," instead of "Hosius, Soto, and the others, twelve learned divines, etc."

The Council of Trent and

against this, such as fear of offending the English Government. In any case, as Hosius was President, Sander his follower was sure to have had a good deal of work at the meetings; Bishop Goldwell also is believed to have lived on the Cardinal's hospitality.* Father Persons said it was "notorious" that Sander was at Trent, and spoke about Anglican services. If this had stood alone, one might have distrusted Father Persons' memory, for it was not infallible, and he was speaking forty-five years after the event. His statement is, however, at least very probable.

Thus constituted, the Congregation had several sessions, and considered various principles and institutions of the Saints and the Fathers bearing on the matter, and arrived at their conclusion with common consent. The document conveying this conclusion† closely corresponds with the letter from England. It is not a decree, or scientific disquisition, but gives—what was asked for—a plain, prompt, and practical answer to the English question. It says, "One cannot go to Protestant services and sermons in the circumstances mentioned, without the anger of God. As the services had been sanctioned by law in order to overthrow Catholicism, such a law cannot be obeyed by any, without their becoming partakers in its wickedness." Then the Congregation continues to exhort the petitioners at some length to have courage, for they had shown in their letter that, if they were clear in their principles, they would resist with constancy. In the conclusion they ask, "Where in the world has the Faith, when bitterly persecuted and pursued with violence, been sheltered and defended by religious and pious men with more constancy, courage and vigour, than in England?"

Whilst the Congregation was at work at Trent in August, a party of English gentry approached Don Alvaro de la Quadra, Bishop of Aquila in the Abruzzi, and Philip II's

* See Seb. Merkle, *Concilium Tridentinum II, Diariorum Collectio*.

† Printed by Garnet, about 1600, as below. Reprinted by H. More, *Historia Provinciæ Anglicanæ*, S.F., 1660, and by James Mendham (Eupator) in 1850. Bayne prints quotations only.

Attendance at Anglican Service

Ambassador in London, with a request apparently identical with that sent to Mascarenas. So we may presume that the petitioners were the same persons as before, and that they had for some reason become unnecessarily anxious about the result of the first application. Though "the cases" about attending Anglican service, which were drawn from the two petitions, were perhaps identical, the petition given to de la Quadra concluded with a further request on the subject of faculties for confession. This supplementary petition, however, will be here passed over. Writing, on August 7th, to Vargas, Spanish Ambassador at Rome,* the Bishop told him of the petition given him for Trent; but, then, availing himself of one of its last clauses, "to do freely what he thought best," he decides to send the case to Rome instead, because he considers that it will be considered there with greater sympathy and knowledge than perhaps might be its fate in the more miscellaneous assembly of the Council. Then he goes on to give Vargas many further details about the case, which he declares to be very difficult, indeed a quite different one from that generally discussed by canonists when treating of *Communicatio in sacris*. And here he draws a picture of the general situation, differing materially from that proposed before. During the two months which had passed, since June, the situation had deteriorated. The strange hopes then entertained, probably due to the rumoured action of France, had passed away, and de Quadra was very gloomy. He speaks as though a death penalty was constantly hanging over the heads of the Catholics unless they attended the new services; though there was as yet, in strict law, no statute which enforced such severity. But we have already heard of Cecil's cunning in manufacturing charges of treason out of hearing Mass, and the relations between France and England were decidedly worse. The French Huguenots, with Elizabeth at their back, were beginning a religious revolt. This would greatly excite Protestant

* Printed by Bayne from a Spanish copy at Simancas. There is a less correct copy in Froude's MSS., British Museum

The Council of Trent and

animosity in England, and exclude any chance of French assistance to the Catholics. Taking these, as well as previous circumstances, into consideration, the Bishop's mind was clear on one point, that absolute intimidation or coercion was really used, in order to enforce attendance at church. Mr. Bayne and Mr. Maitland do not at all agree here ; perhaps because they have not yet adequately studied the sufferings of Sir Thomas Wharton and his companions. I quite allow, however, that there was, as a rule, little strong coercion used at this early period of Elizabeth's reign, except towards leaders, such as the Bishops, or at the time of a crisis.

De Quadra of course did not ask for one answer rather than another ; but he seems perhaps to hope that the Pope would not lay down any new law or general regulation, but leave each case to be settled on its merits. He had himself, he says, acted in that way. With those who had been at services he was wont "to extenuate the sin," in order to avert downheartedness. But he was careful not to minimize with those who had resisted bravely ; for he feared that, if he did so, they would make altogether light of the offence, and actually "communicate" with little scruple. He also notes that the obligation of avoiding scandal was more binding on some than on others.*

* Dr. Maitland, and still more Mr. Bayne, have convinced themselves that de Quadra thought or hoped that the Pope would allow attendance at service. To this they are inclined by de Quadra's account of the pressure put upon the Catholics to make them go to Church, which they think is very exaggerated. But then they do not take into consideration the example of cruelty used against recusants at the time of Martinengo's projected visit. Mr. Bayne even thinks that I am unjust to Cecil on that occasion, in charging him with "infamous hypocrisy," when he "took God to record" that he "meant no evil" to the many innocent victims whom he had imprisoned, fined and disgraced (*The Month*, Vol. XCIX) for doing that which he himself had done four years earlier. Mr. Bayne even insists on Cecil's "honesty," and thinks that his words, just quoted, were "not hypocritical, but merely a protest that he served no private ends." That cannot be. Cruelty such as his could only be inspired by hatred of the religion which he had himself more than once professed. Macaulay (thinking of the year 1580 or so, when the death penalty was freely enforced) says : "The great stain upon (Cecil's) memory is that for differences of opinion for which he would risk nothing himself, in the day of his power, he took away without scruple the lives of others." As that cannot be called "honest," so neither can his "want of scruple" in 1561.

Attendance at Anglican Service

A phrase, often found in these papers, about going to Anglican services; needs a word of explanation. It is this—that Elizabeth forced her Catholic subjects “to live the life of Protestants.” For Italians and Spaniards of the sixteenth century the hereditary enemy to their faith was the Turk. But bitter though the Turk’s persecution was, he did not as a rule make the conquered Christians “live the life of the Turk”: and so the Tudor tyranny was in this respect even more barbarous than the Turkish. The Turks did not hunt their subjects into mosques, while Elizabeth constrained Catholic Englishmen to her reformed services against their consciences, because she wished them “to live the life of Protestants.” Moreover her formulas by law established pressed on the people not only in church on Sundays, but also at christenings, and at graves, in prayers morning and evening, in fine everywhere. To resist such tyranny was a prime duty of a man and of a Christian, as well as of a Catholic. It was exactly at morning service on Sundays that the heads of the submissive were counted, and that blind obedience was made into gospel. The compulsory Sunday service was therefore especially to be resisted, because it was the chief means of enforcing “the life of Protestants.”

We now come to the fortune of de Quadra’s application at Rome.* It was handed into the Holy Office, and was consigned to a congregation of three men of high standing, two of them Dominicans, the third a Minorite, the future Pope Sixtus V. By them the application of the English gentlemen, with its remarkable vein of hope, and de Quadra’s rather depressing letter, were reduced to a “case,” which was extremely simple.

CASE. Prince X. has forbidden, under pain of death, any of his subjects to be Catholics, but all must “live the life of heretics.” He also orders them to be present while Psalms are sung in the vulgar tongue; while lessons are recited from the Bible, also in the vulgar tongue; also (as a rule) while sermons

* *The Opinion of the Inquisitors at Rome*, printed in Spanish by Bayne, from Simancas.

The Council of Trent and

are preached in support of such doctrines. *Query.* Can a Catholic subject attend without danger to Salvation?

It is interesting to note some of the omissions. Elizabeth's name is not here. It does not affect the substance of the case. Her religion also has no name. No fault is found with the text of the new liturgy. It was not taken from any heresiarch, but from the Bible. The language, however, was "the vulgar tongue," a circumstance which was, in those days, extremely suspicious, to say the least of it. The frequency of Protestant sermons is not forgotten, and de Quadra's strong insistence that there was always "absolute coercion," is simplified into the phrase "under the pain of death."

The answer turned chiefly on this—that the Act of Uniformity was intended "to promote the life of heretics." There were three illicit acts in the case: "(1) To give up living as a Catholic; (2) to adopt the life of heretics; (3) to be present at their services." It was further explained that *participatio in sacris*, with heretics and excommunicated persons, was not so great an obstacle here as "the profession of their life and errors." For why else did these Catholic petitioners wish to go to Anglican church service, except to evade the punishments imposed on Catholics, *by being reputed heretics?* The rest of the answer is taken up with the faculties for giving absolution to those who have fallen into heresy. This we are for the present omitting.

If we compare this answer of the Roman inquisitors with that given by the Divines at Trent we shall find that the differences correspond closely with the differences between the persons who make the two petitions. The Council was questioned by laymen, actually under the penalties of the English laws, who confess that they are swayed now by fears, now by deceptive hopes. The object of the answer made to them was, therefore, after stating the doctrine clearly, to exhort to courage and perseverance. In the second case the inquirer was a bishop, in no immediate danger, who confesses that he had not been quite clear and consistent in his answers. No exhortations

Attendance at Anglican Service

were sent to him, but an answer, which enforces several principles useful for the occasion, and above all insists that this liturgy is in reality an act of submission to an heretical creed.

The answer reached the Bishop of Aquila, and was reported by him to Spain on November 8th, 1562.* This reporting was necessary because of the clauses annexed about absolution from heresy. De Quadra knew how irritated the English Government would have been if it discovered that he had intervened in that matter. He had, therefore, to ask his own government for further directions, and he died in August, 1563, perhaps before an answer from Madrid arrived; at all events none is now known. This makes it probable that the answer from Rome, about going to Protestant Church, was in this way also lost on the journey; it was never published in this country. No contemporary or subsequent writer is known to allude to it; and it has only lately been recovered from the archives at Simancas.

The answer from Trent on the other hand passed into the literature of the subject. It is strange that we do not seem to have any reference to it in the extant letters of Cardinal Allen, especially as he was, at that very moment, the protagonist of Catholic resistance in this matter. The historian Dodd, however (a well-read man indeed, but not noted for accuracy), asserts that Allen used to "quote the ruling" when working in Lancashire, in 1562-5.† So we may very well hope that a confirmation of this will yet be recognized. The earliest explicit reference to *The Decision of Trent*, found by Mr. Bayne, is made by Gregory Martin, and must refer to the year 1570 or thereabouts. He also quotes Father Persons' *Brief Discours*, which mentions it in the year 1580. He also quotes one of the Oscott MSS., entitled, *An Answer to a Comfortable Advertisement*, written about the year 1588. This is important because it gives the title in an

* A translation of this letter will be found in the *Spanish Calendar*. It recapitulates the story in brief.

† Dodd's *History*, Bayne, p. 166, note.

The Council of Trent and

earlier form than has yet been known, *The Resolution of Cardinal Hosius, Soto, and others, Twelve learned Divines at the Council of Trent, concerning going to Church with Protestants in England.** The hortatory letter is here called "The Epistle to the Nobility of England."

About the year 1600 the *Resolution of Trent* was printed by Father Henry Garnet, with an English translation, as an appendix to his *Treatise of Christian Renunciation*.† It is through him that the text is still preserved. We hear some details of this edition through his letter to Father Persons of June 2nd, 1601.‡ Their correspondence had grown out of a custom of that day among Catholics, of calling those who went to Anglican service "Schismatics." So long as the word was only used rhetorically, it was well enough; for going-to-church under Elizabethan circumstances was the most deadly of all preludes to schism. Yet it was not formally Schism, and the Council never said it was. Father Garnet, however, had done this, and Father Persons had blamed his inaccuracy. Garnet thereupon answered: "I wrote a book of collections out of the Holy Fathers, intitulated, *Of Christian Renunciation*, to which I added *The Declaration of the Council of Trent*, which I think confirmeth all our opinion." In his translation (not in his Latin text) Garnet made the mistake of adding marginal notes, which refer to the circumstances of his own day. It is just possible that these notes have proved a stumbling-block to Mr. Bayne, who has suggested that the letter of Hosius is a later "conflation," and "not an historical document." But Mr. Bayne's reason for this suggestion is feeble. The style, he notes, is quite unlike the precise didactic forms used in the decrees and canons of the Council. But this proves nothing, because the letter to the Council called for a homily rather than for a decree;

* Bayne, p. 292. See previous note.

† Secretly printed, only three copies now known: at Oscott, Cambridge University Library, and the Incorporated Law Society's Library.

‡ Garnet to Persons, June, 1601. Stonyhurst MSS. Grenc, *Collectanea P*, printed by Gerard, *The Month*, Vol. XCI.

Attendance at Anglican Service

so that the circumstance noted rather confirms than weakens the credit of the text.*

I conclude with two quotations. The first is from Queen Elizabeth. We do not know how much of the above story came to her ears, nor with what glosses, but she made use of it in 1571, and as usual, deceitfully. She was then engaged in an attempt to wheedle the Duke of Anjou into a marriage with Anglican services. So she wrote in her instructions, "In our services there is no part that hath not been, nay that is not at this day used in the Church of Rome, *as of late the same hath been allowed by the last Council of Trent.*"† How sweetly characteristic of Elizabeth! To whom else would it have occurred to seize upon one sentence from *the case* sent to Trent, in order to misrepresent the whole of the Tridentine decision against her!‡ Nevertheless she confesses by implication that she knew about the transactions, which the historians of the Council have hitherto always passed over in silence.

We have above quoted Cardinal Allen's frank words about the worldly-wise Catholic temporizers of 1562. This was his conclusion in 1578: "By persevering diligence we so completely overcame this difficulty that no one is any longer regarded as a genuine Catholic, capable of absolution, who does not altogether refrain from every appearance of evil in regard to communication with heretics. And whereas in the judgment of many

* Garnet says, in his preface, that he had never seen another copy besides the one he was using. Again, there was so little circulation of texts among the Catholics of that day, that the conflation of texts is practically unheard of amongst them.

† Sir Dudley Digges, *The Compleat Ambassador*.

‡ At the beginning of the petition sent to Trent (*Doc. I*) through Mascareñas, we read of the Anglican services: "Psalms are recited and lessons read from both Testaments in the vulgar tongue." In Bishop Quadra's letter to Rome (*Doc. II*), which is a sort of amplification of this, we read: "Common prayers contain no false doctrine whatever, nor anything impious. It is all Scripture, or prayers taken from the Catholic Church, though they have omitted, etc." The true inference from these statements is that, the more favourable they are to the Anglican Service, the more emphatic the condemnations of Trent and of Rome.

The Council of Trent

worldly-wise men this strict enforcement of ecclesiastical discipline seemed likely to lessen greatly the number of Catholics, the Lord God has shown by experience the contrary to be true. For we have now more confessors and genuine Catholics than, with all our indulgence and connivance, we then had concealed Christians."

J. H. POLLEN, S.J.

ONE ODD MAN : AND ANOTHER

The Odd Man in Malta. By John Wignacourt. (Chapman and Hall.)

Mrs. Maxon Protests. By Anthony Hope. (Methuen.)

I

IT is quite ridiculously hard for educated Catholics to realize the liberal ignorance of their otherwise intelligent and understanding neighbours about the Catholic religion. Yet of this ignorance there are constant rude reminders. In the ordinary talk that goes on amongst men, sooner or later the conversation is likely to drift towards religion. If anyone present is known to be a Catholic, his opinion may be asked as that of an expert on some subject, concerning which a Catholic elementary-school child could answer with precision. I remember once being requested by a little group of medical men to tell them what was an Indulgence. They explained that they had been visiting a Maltese church, and saw that an Indulgence was there offered them, and wanted to know what exactly it meant. I obtained breathing space by explaining with a smile that they were mistaken in imagining that the Indulgence had been "offered" to *them*. But after the smile on both sides had passed away, how was I to explain what is meant by an Indulgence to men who had no idea of the real meaning of sin, who had never heard of the distinction between the guilt of sin and its punishment, who knew nothing of the difference in their effects between the Sacrament of Baptism and the Sacrament of Penance, who had never been to Confession in their lives, who had never so much as heard of the Canonical Penances in the Early Church, or of the Pardons therefrom granted at the Prayer of the Martyrs? I did not know where to begin. Obviously, it was neither the place nor the time to deliver a lecture,

One Odd Man : and Another

and I felt much at the same disadvantage as my friends the doctors would have felt, had I suddenly asked them to explain to me the meaning of a highly technical term, of which the true meaning could not possibly be grasped without the knowledge of many other medical terms and principles altogether outside my ken. But in the one case—my ignorance of medicine—the ignorance is acknowledged on both sides ; in the other case—their ignorance of ordinary Catholic doctrine—the doctors acknowledge it not, and would be offended if it were insisted upon. In the current literature of the day, whether novels or books of travel and adventure, or biographies of famous men, or what purports to be serious history, everywhere one finds references to Catholicism (this is in itself a very significant fact), but everywhere a lack of suspicion of ignorance combined with ignorance the most complete.

It is no longer hatred, or even positive dislike, or wilful misinterpretation. Almost everyone wishes nowadays to be respectful and appreciative and polite and understanding towards what is often called our "venerable," or our "beautiful," or our "fascinating" religion. It is ignorance pure and simple, ignorance of our technical terms, ignorance of our ways and habits of thought, ignorance of our principles. In illustration, I will take two books (almost any others would have served my purpose as well)—two books as unlike one another as books can be, both with much to recommend them in different ways, both kindly in tone, and both free from any suspicion of wilful prejudice.

One shall be a costly illustrated work—descriptive of a country in which its writer has lived, evidently in the esteem of all men, a happy life of many generous appreciations of his surroundings. The other shall be a cheap and thoroughly English novel by one of the best-known of our popular writers. The first book is *The Odd Man in Malta*, and the author calls himself John Wignacourt.*

* This is evidently a pseudonym. John Wignacourt was a famous Grand Master of the Knights of St. John in Malta. For convenience' sake we will, however, call the author of the book before us Mr. Wignacourt.

One Odd Man : and Another

On its cover we read the Publisher's appreciation :

This book is an account of an odd island by the Odd Man, for such is the position of the civilian in Malta. Although this volume is written throughout in the lighter vein, and overflows with amusing anecdotes, it is the work of one who has personally delved among the prehistoric shrines of the island and knows the people from their earliest origins. Economic problems, traditions of dress, language and race are discussed, while the whole book is bathed in the warm sunlight and dazzling colours of the Mediterranean.

All this is, I think, very true. The chapter, for example, on a Maltese Johnson is delightfully clever and well written. Yet on one subject, the religion of the Maltese people, its author unconsciously conveys a totally false impression to his readers. No doubt he has "personally delved among the prehistoric shrines of the island"; but most certainly he has not visited its existing shrines, at least with any comprehension of the real inwardness of the devotion of the worshippers who throng those shrines to-day.

Mr. Wignacourt starts with the assumption, shared, as we are often reminded, by so many merely superficial observers of the Catholic Religion, that Catholicism has, at least in Latin countries, "taken over" many features of Paganism. By this it is meant not merely that Catholicism has assimilated all that is true in every religion, just as supernatural religion is built upon natural religion which it presupposes, but that Catholic worship of our Lady and the Saints is not in any way essentially different from the old worship of Greek and Roman gods and goddesses—the same worship under different names. Mr. Wignacourt is not ashamed to state this extravagant opinion with startling frankness. Thus he writes: "The ancient folk from whom the Maltese are descended were essentially religious, and had probably developed an advanced form of worship while the Aryans were still floundering in magic rites. The Catholic Church has known how to mould this good material to the glory of God, and so *the old religion prevails, but directed into*

One Odd Man : and Another

different channels. As mother-worshippers they must worship a woman, and so instead of Astarte they worship the Virgin." By way of proof, we are gravely assured that "it is curious to observe, when the streets are decorated for a religious *festa*, the number of emblems which pertain more properly to Venus and her Southern predecessor." I have questioned both priests and educated laymen in Malta who have been acquainted with Maltese religious *feste* all their lives, but I have found no one who has the slightest conception of what Mr. Wignacourt can mean. He is simply the victim of a preconceived theory. He looked for "emblems of Venus and her Southern predecessor"—and found what he looked for in some simple natural token of joy and festivity. Further on we read: "The *festas* are numerous, and mark not only the days of Saints, but appear to embrace also several pagan festivals. The worship of Osiris and Isis has thus merged into that of John the Baptist and the Virgin Mary." We are gravely informed that "in Sliema Mary is *Stella Maris*." What would Mr. Wignacourt think of anyone who, as evidence that "in Greenwich and in North Devon the worship of Isis is merged into that of the Virgin Mary," should adduce the fact that "in both Greenwich and Ilfracombe the Virgin Mary is *Stella Maris*, the Star of the Sea"? Yet there is as much, or as little, reason for making the statement about Greenwich and North Devonshire as there is about Malta. The Catholic Church at Greenwich, as well as that at Ilfracombe, are dedicated, like the parish church at Sliema, to "Our Lady, Star of the Sea." If this fact proves anything wonderful about the Catholics of Sliema, it must of necessity prove the same wonderful thing about the Catholics of Greenwich and Ilfracombe. Mr. Wignacourt has no idea that Catholicism is essentially the same in England, and in Malta, and in Sicily, and in Brittany, and in the Tyrol, all the world over. In another place he writes: ■

Religion in Brittany and Malta is of the same character; there is the same reverence for saints and relics; the same love of

One Odd Man : and Another

ceremony and of ritual ; the same predilection for the Virgin ; the same processions ; the same offerings are hung in the churches. It is essentially objective ; the religion of a sensuous people. When you cross from Italy to Austria the images of the Virgin give place to those of Christ. The long-headed Hamites could never have evolved monotheism, nor probably a supreme male deity.

But no one, neither Hamite nor author, has ever "evolved" monotheism. Belief in one God is not a development evolved from first principles : it is an essential part of natural religion and can be attained by the human reason from a consideration of the universe, which is open to all men. It is itself the first principle of Judaism and Mohammedanism, as well as of Christianity. Now, the "long-headed Hamites" in Malta are emphatically Christians, though Mr. Wignacourt implies that they are polytheists, like their Pagan ancestors. Furthermore, he tells us that "probably" the long-headed Hamites could not have evolved "a supreme male Deity." We are here on very sacred ground indeed, and must walk with reverence. Does Mr. Wignacourt really think that any Christians believe "in a supreme male Deity" ? Surely he must know that we believe that God is a Spirit ? It is so clear to every Catholic—one would have thought that it ought to have been clear to every Christian—that the idea of sex does not enter into our idea of the Divinity. It is true, no doubt, that the Eternal Father is represented in Holy Scripture as the Ancient of Days, and that the Holy Ghost appeared as a Dove, but the Father is not a Man any more than the Holy Spirit is actually a Dove. The Eternal Son—this is the central Christian Mystery, distinguishing it from all non-Christian, monotheistic religions—took in time the Nature of Man, "born under the Law, born of a Woman." But the doctrine of the Incarnation in no way justifies Mr. Wignacourt's language. His suggestion that the southerners worship the Woman Mary rather than the Man Christ Jesus is preceded by the observation that "in the mountains of the Tyrol the women wear bowler hats

One Odd Man : and Another

and take them off to a man ” ; and so “ when you cross from Italy to Austria the images of the Virgin give place to those of Christ.” Here is theory run mad. It may, or may not be the case—I do not know—that there are more crucifixes to be seen in Austria than in Malta or Italy. What I do know is that in Austria there is as much devotion to our Lady as in any other Catholic country. (Strange though it may be to Mr. Wignacourt, *all* Catholic countries and all practising Catholics in every country have, to use his quaint expression, “ the same predilection for the Virgin.”) I know also that in Malta and Italy, and in every part of the world, love of the Mother leads to supreme love of her Divine Son. Moreover, everyone who knows Catholic churches in Malta knows that they are singularly profuse in crucifixes, to which there is much popular devotion. This is the case, for example, in the parish church in Sliema (dedicated, we remember, to the Star of the Sea), in the Dominican church close by, as well as in the Franciscan church in Valetta. Love of the Mother and the Son are never sundered in Malta or anywhere else ; in every Catholic country they are found and bound together.

When we are told that the religion of the Maltese and Bretons is “ essentially objective,” we can only understand that the religion of the Maltese and Bretons has an Object. In other words, they worship God, whom they believe to have revealed Himself to men in the religion of the Incarnation. We read also that their religion is “ the religion of a sensuous people.” By this Mr. Wignacourt cannot mean that the Maltese are a *sensual* people, for he writes elsewhere : “ I never knew women more moral ” ; and again that he would, if he had a plantation in the Colonies, wish to have Maltese to work it, for “ I know that they would work as hard as anybody in the world and as cheaply, and that they would keep free from vice.” By *sensuous*, then, we should not understand *sensual* ; so when we learn that “ the religion of the Maltese is the religion of a sensuous people,” we can only understand that their religion is the religion of a

One Odd Man : and Another

people alive to impressions made upon the senses. But it is matter of common knowledge that one aspect of Catholic worship appeals to the senses of everybody. This is justified, amongst other reasons, by the fact that we are not angels, but men and women with senses given us by our Maker. What Mr. Wignacourt calls "the religion of a sensuous people" is not peculiar to Malta and Brittany any more than is "reverence for saints and relics, processions and votive offerings hung in churches."

Though Processions and Votive Offerings (not essential to the Catholic religion anywhere) are to be found in Catholic countries everywhere—in Liverpool and in London and in New York as in Valetta, or Sliema or Citta Vecchia—I am not suggesting that national characteristics and temperament and history are without effect upon the accidental and external aspect of Catholicism in various countries. But I am stating a truism when I say that, *essentially*, Catholicism is quite independent of any climatic or variable conditions. Moreover, whatever differences in custom really exist are surprisingly few and of no significance. It is somewhat curious that Mr. Wignacourt has failed to observe many of these (such as they are), whilst laying stress upon differences that have no existence save in his imagination. For example, it is not only the Maltese clergy, but Catholic priests all over the world, who on every Feast of our Lady recite the *Ave Maris Stella*. But many English-speaking Catholics, lay and clerical, visiting Malta, profess themselves much disturbed by the Maltese custom of saying prayers aloud in the churches. The resulting hum is at first undoubtedly distracting. Again, for those who are not used to it, there is something odd in watching (as I have often watched) a worshipper, as an act of voluntary penance, crawling on the knees from the entrance of a large church right up to the High Altar. This is thought nothing of in Malta : it is merely an act of humility recognized by long-established local custom. Still, edifying though it be, it would create very unedifying astonishment were it to be attempted at the

One Odd Man : and Another

Brompton Oratory or in the Westminster Cathedral, or even in any ordinary church in Italy. The Maltese, of course, understand this, and would never think of taking their purely local ways out of their own island. They are the least self-conscious of beings, and in church never look at other people, or fancy that anyone is looking at them, whilst they take their chairs about, so that they may face now one altar and now another.

So far as there are special characteristics of Maltese religion which go deeper than these mere externals, I think that Mr. Wignacourt has failed signally to apprehend them. For instance, he writes : " I have never known a people so devout, and the women are pious to a degree." Now, in very many Catholic countries, "*the women are pious to a degree.*" That which is especially remarkable in Malta is the piety of the *men*. I shall never forget the first day I arrived in Malta some years ago. It was a Sunday and just twelve o'clock. I got on shore as soon as I could, and found my way to the nearest church—one near to the Custom House, in a poor quarter of the town. It was crowded with men, not a woman to be seen—all labourers and all in their shirt-sleeves, perfectly at home, and saying their prayers aloud. I had never seen or heard anything like it anywhere. Everything observed since has borne out that first experience. In Valetta the churches are all crowded with men every day, from the first Mass at five o'clock—often four—to the last (in most churches) at ten, whilst in the country the male population mostly goes to Mass every morning at four before proceeding to their work at five. I am certain that the interior subjective side of religion (the essence of all true religion) is extraordinarily developed in Malta. The Maltese may "love ceremony and ritual"; but little ceremonial is to be observed in their ordinary religious practices. In Valetta and Sliema (this is if possible more true of the country districts) you cannot go into any church in the evening, about the time of the *Ave Maria* at sunset, without finding in it a crowd—more of men probably than women—praying at the end of

One Odd Man : and Another

the day's work—staying in the church for a considerable time, adoring their Lord, present in the Tabernacle. In Valetta, out of a total population of twenty-two thousand people, there are more than a thousand communions *every* day, and more than a hundred every day in practically all the village churches.

Nor, I repeat with emphasis and satisfaction, do the people at any time feel any special need of ceremonial. The last Sunday that I had the happiness to be in Malta, I heard Mass at the Englishman's sacred hour of eleven in the beautiful Cathedral church of St. John. It was crowded to the doors. There were hardly any women present (they had, of course, heard Mass early, and were about their household duties), but men (not in their shirt-sleeves here) of all classes, all of them saying their prayers most devoutly. In an English Protestant church some accompaniment would be desired in the way of hymn-singing, or chanting, or leading of the congregation by the recitation of prayers or preaching. Here there was no such support, nor did anybody need it. There was simply a priest at the distant altar saying Mass in what I, an Englishman, regretted to notice (no Maltese would have noticed it!) looked to be a very shabby vestment. Everybody in the church (excepting myself) was minding his own business. The quality and age of the vestment was, I imagine, the business of the sacristan—certainly it was not that of the worshippers. It occurred to me that many a High Church Anglican would have been terribly disappointed at such a service in such a church on Sunday at eleven o'clock. He would certainly have been accustomed to something far more elaborate at home. Yet the religion of the Maltese is set down as "the religion of a sensuous people." It most certainly is the religion of a prayerful people.

But Mr. Wignacourt may say, if he happens to read this article, that I am trying to prove too much, and that it is ridiculous to maintain that the generality of the Maltese are not superstitious and even ignorant about their religion. Well, if he were to say this, I should

One Odd Man : and Another

simply not agree with him. I have talked to many Maltese about their religion, whilst I do not believe, from the evidence afforded by his book, that he has done the same. It was not necessary for him—he knew already, without talking to them at all, that their religion was only that of Isis and Osiris, of Ceres, or of Venus, or of Astarte under another form! So why trouble to investigate? But experience is better than theory always, and my experience is that the poor Maltese know their religion extraordinarily well. Mr. Wignacourt has informed us that “the worship of Osiris and Isis has merged into that of St. John the Baptist and the Virgin Mary.” Now here is a challenge for him. I challenge him to find any uneducated Maltese who has ever heard even the name either of Osiris or of Isis, and also I challenge him to find any Maltese, educated or uneducated, who is ignorant of the fact that the honour which he pays to St. John the Baptist is paid to the great forerunner of Christ. Above all I challenge him to find me any Maltese who does not know perfectly well why he honours the Blessed Mother of his Lord. That honour is, as every Maltese knows, due to her because of her relation to her Son and to those whom her Divine Son redeemed by shedding His Precious Blood. The Maltese devotion to our Lady and to the Saints is essentially Christian—for the sake of Christ.

Let me record a conversation I had one day in a hair-dresser's shop in Valetta. It is not a large shop, and the proprietor (who, by the way, casually informed me that, as is common in Malta, he was the proud parent of twelve children) is assisted by his son, a youth of about eighteen summers. This lad his father addressed by the pet name of Cenz (the Maltese are most Christianly affectionate in their family relations), whereupon I asked whether he had been named after St. Vincent of Paul, in whose honour there had just been a charity-collection in all the streets. I was told at once, *No*—the boy had been christened after St. Vincent Ferrer. It was then volubly explained to me that St. Vincent de Paul was indeed a great Saint, but that St. Vincent Ferrer was a

One Odd Man : and Another

greater. For St. Vincent de Paul had practised charity in an heroic degree, whereas St. Vincent Ferrer had been full of charity, but, besides, had been a wonderful preacher and a *taumaturgo*, or wonder worker. And then the good man spoke enthusiastically of the great Saints much venerated in Malta. "San Vincenzo, *taumaturgo*, Sant' Antonio, *taumaturgo*!" with much emphasis. As he then paused, I ventured to add "San Gerardo, *taumaturgo*." Here he hesitated; St. Gerard is unfortunately not well known in Malta, but my friend remembered suddenly the devotion to him in the Conventual Church, and said "Si," and then went on with his own list. "San Nicolao Tolentino, *taumaturgo*," he cited, and another Augustinian Saint, unknown to me, but evidently much honoured in Malta, with another *taumaturgo*. His son was listening to him all the time with flashing eyes. Again, a boatman once told me, with much animation, the story of St. Publius, whose statue, with the lion of his martyrdom at his feet, catches one's eye just before one lands in the harbour.* The Maltese will tell you that they have always guarded their religion most jealously as they first received it from their Apostle, the Apostle who converted Publius, the mighty Apostle of the Gentiles himself. Their affection for St. Paul is something very touching. I have often asked them if they loved St. Paul, always to receive the same answer: "Surely, he is our father." I was told by a venerable priest, attached to the parochial church of St. Paul in Valetta, that when the great image of the Apostle of the Gentiles is carried from that church into the streets on his Feast day, the people often have tears in their eyes. I naturally asked *Why*, and was told: "Because they love him so much." To use Mr. Wignacourt's own words: Whose mythological worship has been "fused" into that of St. Paul?

* I was once looking at the large pictures which adorn the beautiful Church of St. Publius in Floriana. Quite a poor man joined me and pointed out the meaning of the various scenes which illustrate St. Paul's landing in the island. Wherever he identified for my benefit St. Publius in a picture, he would add with much pride, "And he was a Prince of Malta!"

One Odd Man : and Another

Two minor examples of Mr. Wignacourt's carelessness I have marked on my margins. The first shall be a very trifling inaccuracy. As a sign that Maltese women are "pious to a degree," Mr. Wignacourt informs us that : "We had a servant who asked for leave one evening for devotional purposes as she *had* to pray in seven churches." If Mr. Wignacourt had inquired of this servant, he would have found that this request was in no way a sign of extraordinary piety, as it would have been made on only one day of the year. He would also have discovered that it most certainly was inaccurate to state that she "*had*" to pray in seven churches—for this was in no way a requirement of her religion, but was purely an act of private devotion. It is the custom of the Maltese (of course the custom of men as well as of women) to visit the Sepulchre in seven churches on Maundy-Thursday. This custom exists also throughout Italy, but I do not think that it is general anywhere else in Catholic Christendom ; though in Irish towns the approximate custom is to visit three churches on that day. Here, then, is a local custom, on which an author might well have had something interesting to say, had he made inquiries. But he makes no inquiries, and puts it down, quite wrongly, as an obligation laid upon a specially pious female.

My second instance concerns the building of churches. Mr. Wignacourt writes : ". . . the continual building of large and costly churches amid the wretched hovels of a populace which can barely live. Money and labour are freely given for this purpose, which, whatever may be said in its favour, here shows itself to be the reverse of utilitarian. But it is of no use to run counter to the nature of a people." And again : "The Maltese show considerable practical zeal in church building, and the laying of stones is not confined to a local big-wig and a formal function. All are willing to build up for themselves a portion of salvation in hard stone and seal it with a hod of mortar. On the other hand, as in the Middle Ages, some churches are in the nature of final lump-sum insurances paid from the wealth accumulated by selling

One Odd Man : and Another

curiosities to the English and other simple folk." And once more : "Malta is crowded with churches, and in spite of the present economic crisis, they are still being built on every hand and on a magnificent scale." These categorical statements are entirely devoid of foundation. Far from churches "still built on every hand and on a magnificent scale," in Valetta only one church (and that a Convent chapel) has been built in the last twenty-five years ; whilst only two churches—one the Church of the Nazarene, and the other an oratory in connection with the Salesian Charitable Institution—have been built during the same period in Sliema. Nor is much church building necessary in Malta, for, as Mr. Wignacourt himself writes, "Malta is crowded with churches" ; there are over fifty in the little town of Valetta, and there is one in every village. I do not myself believe that any "hovels of the populace" in Malta are nearly as "wretched" as those to be found in the shameful slums of our own towns.

However this may be, the Maltese population already possess "large and costly churches," which, thank God, unlike the English poor (robbed of their ancient inheritance), they not only love, but also use. Many a magnificent House of God is their house too. If other churches were needed they would certainly sacrifice themselves, even go hungry, to build them ; but needed they are not, except perhaps in a few cases quite in the depths of the country. But our author, presumably because this sort of writing pleases him, tells us about "all" the Maltese contributing "a hod of mortar" to the new churches, and the rich shopkeepers effecting "final lump-sum insurances" and the rest of it, when the simple fact is that no Maltese labourer has—at least for the last quarter of a century—given a hod of mortar, and no Maltese shopkeeper any lump-sum, small or great, towards the building of a church in Valetta, for the simple reason that no new church has been needed. "Meantime" (that is what time the churches are being built) "the steed starves." I do not quite know what Mr.

One Odd Man : and Another

Wignacourt wishes to convey by the metaphor of "the steed," but it is certain that no starvation, either of horse or man, is due in Malta to the building of churches. In a Catholic country such as Malta, death from starvation—alas! so common in many Protestant countries—is absolutely unknown. The charity of the people makes it impossible.* The faithful Catholics of Ireland have had in our generation to do over again the church-building work done by their fathers in the days of old; but in Malta no churches have been razed to the ground by fanatical enemies of the Catholic Name. Here are no Catholic shrines in alien hands, as are the two Cathedrals in Dublin, once Catholic now Protestant, and the Cathedral Church of the City of the Violated Treaty.

II

In *Mrs. Maxon Protests*, Mr. Anthony Hope has given us a popular story—how popular may be gathered from the fact that three more expensive editions, published in one year, have given place to a shilling issue, notwithstanding the dearness of materials in this third year of the war. This very large circulation in many ways it deserves. It is eminently readable, yet is marked by thought and has its clever observations on matters of vital interest to us all. The central theme is marriage, and the plan (there is no plot) is to show how a certain theory of marriage works out in practice. Mrs. Maxon is a true protestant. She protests against many things, especially against "institutions"—against the tiresome conduct of her husband—a rising barrister, hoping soon to be a judge—and (at first I think only incidentally, as a result of that primary protest) against the whole Christian conception of marriage, as represented to her by her husband and his friend Mr. Attlebury, a High-Church

*A Protestant soldier told me recently that the first thing which turned his mind towards the Catholic religion was the charity which he saw the very poor Maltese observe to their brethren. He said that it seemed to him that in Malta "everyone was ready to share his crust with his neighbour."

One Odd Man : and Another

clergyman. She then protests against respectability, and what Mr. Hope calls its "code" as represented by a middle-class family in Woburn Square who induce her lover to leave her—a lover with whom she is living, after leaving her husband, in a new kind of "marriage" devised by herself. She next protests against devotion to duty, when, after her husband has divorced her, a soldier will not marry her (on learning her story) because of the harm it would do the subalterns in the regiment which he expects soon to command. Finally she protests against the Catholic Church, when it stands in the way of Dick Dennehy's marrying her after Major Merrian has thrown her over. Excepting in the last case, she is worsted—worsted by the Institution of Marriage (which, strive as she may, casts her ashore as a derelict), worsted by "the Code" (which leaves her abandoned and alone), worsted by the Regiment, of which she is deemed unworthy even by a typical man of the world, "without much religion."

Only against the Catholic Church does she come off victorious—the Catholic Church represented by the conscience of Dick Dennehy. For Dick, after a great struggle, succumbs to her charms. But here it would be unfair to blame Mrs. Maxon's creator. For the defeat of the Catholic Church is obviously not really a defeat of the Church, but only a defeat of poor Dennehy. True, there are Catholics who are not proof against strong temptation; but never yet has there been a Catholic to yield to temptation *in the way* in which Dick Dennehy yielded. But first let me say that I think Anthony Hope is quite fair in the manner in which he puts the ethical aspects of the case. The free-love view is given by a clever, freethinking, literary man, and by his still more clever and more freethinking wife, and by Mrs. Maxon herself; the orthodox view, feebly enough, by Cyril Maxon (the husband), by Attlebury his adviser, by Dennehy, but very forcibly indeed by the logic of events. Perhaps I am quite wrong in thinking that Anthony Hope himself sympathizes with the view that, at least in

One Odd Man : and Another

extreme cases, and after process of law, a wife is justified (and also a husband) in breaking the marriage bond and making fresh ties in the lifetime of the former partner. In any case he does not obtrude his views—he holds the scales even.

It is not his fault perhaps, but his misfortune, that he forces us to realize how far we have travelled in ethics not only from the days of Jane Austen, but even from those of Anthony Trollope. No young women have less in common between them than Winnie Maxon, and (say) Lily Dale. Trollope could never have even imagined Winnie Maxon, selfish, self-centred, out only for what she considered happiness, with no regard for the feelings or convictions of others, craving for what she called love, passing lightly from one lover to another, yet all the while eminently satisfied with herself. Had Trollope contemplated such a creature, he would have regarded her with loathing, and as utterly impossible in that England of gentlefolk which he knew and described so faithfully. I may be wrong, but I do not think that Anthony Hope could have created Lily Dale. I wonder whether he even likes Lily Dale. Her reticence, her modesty, her gentleness, her faithfulness, her deep affection, he cannot help liking. But does he, I wonder, like Lily Dale herself? Whether or not, he would say that she is "Victorian," and has passed away from his sphere. In saying this, I think that he would be wrong. I believe that, allowing for the disappearance of utterly unessential things and the innocuous change of manners, England is still compact of Lily Dales, and that Winnie Maxons are still the exceptions. If no one can blame an author for writing of people as he sees them now, rather than as his great predecessors saw them, or as we ourselves may still see them, we have every right to find fault with him if he fails to present truly that which he claims to describe. And this is precisely my quarrel with Anthony Hope. His picture of Dick Dennehy is in no way convincing to those who know the Dick Dennehy of the world as they really are. He, too, in this alone resembling the

One Odd Man : and Another

civilian in Malta, is "an Odd Man." If this is true, Anthony Hope has so far failed as an artist ; he has so far failed in his own profession. My complaint is two-fold. Dennehy does not speak as a Catholic Irishman, or as any other Catholic, would speak, and—this is of course far more important—the account of the conflict he undergoes is psychologically all astray. He arrives at a mental state at which no Catholic—remaining a Catholic, and we are expressly told that Dennehy remains a convinced Catholic—could possibly arrive.

First, with regard to the way in which he talks—this little dialogue : "'Theory against practice—that's the way of it always,' said Stephen. 'Well, in a sense ye're right there,' Dennehy conceded. 'It needs a priest to tell you what to do, and a man to do it.'" I need not say how inconceivable it is that an educated Catholic, talking to another educated man who is an Agnostic, should utter such twaddle as this. All Catholics know perfectly well what to do in the broad issues of life. Their difficulty—our difficulty—concerns very little the theory, though often it very much touches the practice, of our religion. No doubt occasionally there may arise a difficulty about the theory, and in such difficulty it is natural to consult a priest, who has to preach officially the observance of the moral law, and is something of an expert in the matter, having, in exceptional cases, theological text-books, to which he may refer—just as lawyers and medical men have their own medical and legal text-books to consult. But all that is out of the ordinary. Ordinarily a priest is concerned not with laying down the well-known Law, with "telling men what they have to do," but rather with granting God's forgiveness to those who repent, and with striving, by means of the supernatural mysteries entrusted to his care, to help his fellow-sinners to observe that Law more faithfully for the time to come. And if a Catholic would never thus bring "the priest" into such a conversation, still less would he be a party to other improbable remarks. "'Ye're an atheist,' observed Dennehy. 'I'm not an atheist, Dick.' 'The

One Odd Man : and Another

Pope'd call you one, and that's enough for a good Catholic like me.' " This is hopeless. To begin with, the Pope would never call a man an atheist who disclaimed atheism. Were the Pope to do so, it would *not* "be enough" for us; it would simply remain an abuse of language. The meaning of words depends upon etymology; and, above all, upon ordinary convention, to which Popes conform, like anyone else. Were the Holy Father, for example, to learn English, he might for a long time remain in ignorance of our conventional distinction between the word *Theist* and the word *Deist*. If he made a mistake in this matter, anyone who might be teaching him English, or anyone who knew him sufficiently well, would of course point out to him his mistake; and no doubt he would afterwards conform his manner of speech to our ordinary usage. The Pope in these matters would not vie with the King of France, who, having made a conversational slip in the gender of a substantive, caused that gender thereafter to be conformed to his own fallibility.

And imagine Dick Dennehy's calling himself "a good Catholic"! Catholics, let Anthony Hope know, are always only too ready to confess themselves to be bad ones. A Catholic might say on some inquiry that called for the avowal, "Well, I am not what I ought to be, but thank God I practise my religion"; or, "You know, I have the Faith"; or more simply, "I am a Catholic." But "I am a good Catholic"—no, never. We all, from the Pope downwards, know and openly confess that this is exactly what we are not. Not one of us is what he ought to be as a Catholic. We feel this especially when we reflect upon all that our religion does for us. I venture to hope that, in the many books which I trust that Anthony Hope may yet live to write, he will never again get into fellowship with Arthur Orton, when ("Holy Maria!") he was trying to impose upon people that he was a Catholic. Again, Dick Dennehy is made to say, "As for the principle of the thing, if you can turn up your nose at the Church Catholic, I should think you could turn it up at

One Odd Man : and Another

the Ledstone family." A Catholic who talked ordinarily about "the Church Catholic," would, I think, as soon think of talking about the Club Carlton, or the Fusiliers Irish. In Latin, of course, we write *Ecclesia Catholica* and *Catholica Ecclesia* indifferently ; but Anthony Hope writes in English. It is a small smudge, but Anthony Hope ought to be careful to have no smudge, small or great, of this kind when he, a Protestant, paints Catholics, when he, an Englishman, takes an Irishman, willy-nilly, as his sitter.

On a Christmas Day, after Dick has walked five miles to Mass, he waits on his way back for Mrs. Maxon, who has taken the innocent and delightful child of their free-thinking friends to the Protestant church. When they come out he addresses them thus : "It is a concession for me to come as far as the door of this place." Catholic men of the world do not make such silly jokes. However, I forgive Mr. Hope this little *gaucherie* for the sake of the words that follow : "The child (the poor little child of unbelieving parents) was thinking of the story of the Child, and finding it most strange and beautiful, the greatest of all her beloved fairy-stories—and yet true. Dennehy gently patted Alice's shoulder. 'In God's good time !' he murmured. 'What do you mean ?' Winnie asked in a low voice. 'True people will find truth, and sweet people do sweet things,' he answered." At last we get words showing recognizable Catholic feeling on the lips of his typical Irish Catholic layman !

And when Mr. Hope comes to an Irish Catholic in another sphere of life, again we cry "Hands off !" When Mrs. Maxon found that three English servants deserted her because she, a divorced woman, was living with Godfrey Ledstone, Dennehy found her "an old Irish woman," to whom he explained the situation—a Mrs. O'Leary—who was "entirely charitable." Soon there was a fresh desertion. It was not this time the servant, but her lover, who deserted Mrs. Maxon. Then it was that Mrs. O'Leary came to the rescue with her remark, "' Cheer up, Mum ! There's as good fish '— !

One Odd Man : and Another

And the old woman shuffled out." It is just what an Irish woman would never say. Her charity, and other considerations, might lead her to live with, and be good to, a poor sinful fellow-creature ; nothing would ever induce her thus to wish her a succession of sinful unions. Be sure that when Godfrey Ledstone left Winnie Maxon, any Mrs. O'Leary in real life would have said : " Thank God ! Thank God—whatever the pain of the moment—for both their sakes ! " Anthony Hope may not understand or sympathize with this attitude. None the less let him realize that it is the attitude of every Irish Catholic, rich and poor, on the face of God's globe.

To return (since we must, to complete this record of our protest against much that is current in the English presentation of Irish character) to Dick Dennehy. It is represented to us that he was much in love with Mrs. Maxon, that for a long period he struggled unsuccessfully against this passion, but in the end gave way, persuading himself that the case was exceptional, and that he could " throw himself on the mercy of his supreme authority [the Church] in a very difficult case." Now this is, merely artistically, all wrong. It shows no knowledge of the way a practising Catholic would *act*, in the beginning at any rate ; and would always *think*, however he might act in the end. Under no conceivable circumstances can the bond of valid marriage between Christians be relaxed by any authority whatsoever. It is, therefore, a matter that in no way concerns " the mercy of the Church," since it is part of the Law of God, which the Church is bound merely to administer. There is no dispensing power. We know full well that very hard cases are to be found. When such cases arise we believe that God gives grace to all who seek it in His appointed ways, wherewith they may overcome temptation, however fierce. But the first thing we observe about Dennehy is that he does not seem to know his religion on the practical side. We read that after his long walk to hear Mass on Christmas Day, he returned " spiritually and physically fortified," but there is no hint that he ever sought the

One Odd Man : and Another

even greater fortitude, without which there was no hope for him in his struggle, the fortitude which he might have derived from Holy Communion. Even when the final catastrophe was impending, when he was "impelled by love, yet racked by conscience," he sought no such help. Nor is there any suggestion that, before handing himself over to what his conscience told him was evil, he went to Confession and sought there the support which he must have known perfectly well that his religion offered him in his hour of need. On the contrary, "when he had to settle this question one way or the other, his decision"—the decision on which so much of vital spiritual import depended—"was one which only the man who came to it himself could judge"—the same man who, a short time before, had said "it needs a priest to tell you what to do"—the same man who, even at the last moment, "was confronted with a straight, rigid, unbending prohibition from an authority which he had always respected as final and infallible." Moreover, he actually thinks it out by himself, in the immediate neighbourhood of the woman of whom he was passionately enamoured. He says: "I must do what I must do, and leave it to the Mercy of God." And so he went to his doom; and when Winnie Maxon herself hesitates, thinking of his conscience, he is able to assure her: "I give you my honour, in my soul I am at peace." At peace, when he knew he was cutting himself off from the sacraments of "the Church that was to him still creed, conscience and half-motherland." To anyone who knows Irish Catholics, the thing is impossible. In real life Dick Dennehy would never have called a very ugly thing by pretty names. A novelist may be an adept at this sort of work. To Dick Dennehy it would have meant exasperating futility. Even if he had tried—and he would never have tried—he could never have deceived himself thus for an instant.

Many of us, when we were young, learned in the lesson-books then provided for English children that Popery had passed away from England and been succeeded by Protestantism as irrevocably as Paganism had passed

One Odd Man : and Another

away from Europe and been succeeded by Christianity. Indeed we used to read that between Paganism and Popery there was but little to choose. For example, when Dean Swift pleaded for the emancipation of the handful of downtrodden Catholics who still lingered here and there in out-of-the-way spots of English soil, he said it was safe to free these serfs, for they could have no baneful influence over their Protestant neighbours, since those neighbours would worship the gods of heathen mythology as soon as they would revert to their fathers' faith. No man will use this sort of language now. Despite the astounding ignorance that prevails as to the real meaning and teaching and practice of our religion, men seem more disposed to-day than at any period since the Reformation to try and find out what Catholicism really means ; and it is the proud privilege of Catholics to speak of what they know. May it be ours in this generation to do something to correct the portraits of Catholics supplied by alien hands in all good faith but in all bad drawing ! In an age of realism, the typical Catholic man and woman must not, alone among their fellows, be left at the mercy of mishandlers.

Dust we may be—but not sawdust. Let the dummy figures of Catholics in current fiction give place to Catholics as we know them in the flesh and in the spirit !

O. R. VASSALL-PHILLIPS, C.S.S.R.

THE CELT, THE SAXON, AND THE NEW SCENE

I

"CELT and Saxon" is the most convenient yet most elusive of contrasts ever coined into a phrase. It is the blank cheque which covers any deficit in sympathy or failure in politics between the different peoples in the British Isles. "Celt and Saxon" is a deep-rooted theme of national psychology as well as the most superficial axiom in political currency. Based on it is the plea for Irish Nationality—and the demand for its extinction. Centuries of close conflict and slow unison have left the problem unsolved and formidable in one part only of the British Isles—Ireland, the Sorrowful Mystery of the Empire. Few things indeed are more difficult to detect than the real ratio of Celt and Saxon in the Isles named from the Brythonic branch of the Celt. To some they are as oil and water together, yet apart, within the one bucket. Others think of them as merged beyond recovery. The makers of ethnological paradox say East Anglia is more Celtic than many parts of Ireland. Lovers of the phrase "Celtic France" are informed by Professor Ripley that the North-East third of France is "more Teutonic than the South of Germany"; and by Jubainville that "there is probably in Germany more Gaulish blood than in France." On these grounds an optimist once discovered that it was the Germans who, unknown to themselves, were defeated in the Franco-Prussian War.

It is not necessary to believe in a "Celtic race" to perceive that Huxley is wrong in asserting that "the arguments about the difference between Anglo-Saxons and Celts are a mere sham and a delusion." If there is no ideal Celt existing, there is at least a Celtic temperament. If there is no Irish nation, there is certainly an Irish problem. The racial causes may be uncertain, but the political product of the causes is with us. And it is time to

The Celt, the Saxon, and

wonder, if not to discover, why there is an Irish problem in varying degree in every daughter dominion and every colonial offspring that England has borne, not excluding her prodigious prodigal the United States. The strife between Celt and Saxon was originally racial, but became religious and fell finally with traces of both previous phases into politics. The Nationalism of offence became the weapon of the Saxon, the Nationalism of defence the shield of the Celt. Nationalism is the result of outer as well as of inner forces. Small nations are anvils and strong nations, if they know their business, are hammers. "If you go into other peoples' countries at all, you should eat them clean up, as we did the Brets here," wrote the strong minded Freeman. English Nationalism shaped if it did not create Irish Nationalism. Polish Nationalism dates from the partition of Poland. France and Germany seem to have alternatively hammered out each other's Nationalism. Franco-German rivalry sprang from a Celto-Teuton base, or, to put it technically, from the old war between the Deutsch and the Walsch, the Dutch and the Welsh, "the people" (presumably of God) and "the foreigners" (for whom God had less exalted uses). This is the original feud of West Europe. "Welsh" was the name the Teuton always gave to the peoples he conceived he had a mission to drive westward. It is the word the Anglo-Saxons gave to the British Celts they drove into Wales. It is the same word the modern Germans give to the French in Lorraine and Burgundy, the latter being regarded as a kind of *Deutschtum irredenta*. The Celt is the literary symbol for the unknown quantity in Western Europe, which has so often eluded and defied the systems of European civilization, before being finally merged in Teutonic States. Nevertheless British history is haunted by the Celt. The groans of the Britons recorded by Gildas, the Welsh Bards, who sang defiance and evil of the newcomers from Germany, the Cornish Giants, who still frighten Saxon children with their "Fee fo fum" (probably Celtic), I smell the blood of an Englishman," Scotch Jacobites and Irish Rebels have all been transmutations of the same old enemy. The Celt is the long laid

the New Scene

ghost appearing and reappearing in History who under considerate treatment can be made a quiet domestic figure, but who cannot be exorcised by fire or iron. If history shows that the Celt cannot escape the Saxon, the Saxon cannot divest his dominions of the Celt, but must eventually come to terms with him.

The Celtic souvenir pervades England herself. Place-names as well as family-names constantly hark back to Celtic roots. Celtic deities leap from the names of Lyddgate and the Isle of Man. Boadicea, the warrior Queen of the British, was literally a Celtic "Victoria," for "Boo" is the Anglicized Irish war cry of Victory. The Harp of the Druids has crept into the Royal Arms, and the Lia Fail or Stone of Destiny, as heathen a block as was ever tucked into a Christian fane, lurks to-day under the Coronation Chair. The Maypoles and Fairies of Merry England were Celtic remnant. Half the folklore and the only Epic of England is Celtic. Many chapters of English history, like St. Paul's Epistle to the *Galatians* or Cæsar's *Gallic War*, acquire a new interest when read in the light of the Celtic question. A twin race culture, such as that in the British Isles, must entail either a twofold energy and health or a double dose of social sickness. In England proper the Celtic element has long been absorbed. In Scotland it has been romanticized. In Wales it has been gratified. In Cornwall it has been "methodized." In the Isle of Man it has been novelized. Only in Ireland has it been consistently antagonized, with occasional lapses into tantalizing conciliation.

For a thousand years the Celtic question was an underlying current of British domestic history. The conflict between invader and aboriginal, which is canonized in the Arthurian legend, was transferred to Wales and to Scotland under the Plantagenet and extended over Ireland under the Tudor. Stuart and Hanoverian have since faced the Celtic question, whether disguised in the strife of tenure or of religion, of dynasty or of party. Ireland suffers still from the last-mentioned

The Celt, the Saxon, and

to a serious extent. In dynastic matters O'Connell proclaimed the "golden link of the Crown," and there are probably more Scotch Jacobites to-day than Irish Nationalists who cherish a sentimental opposition to the Guelphs. In the matter of land tenure Irishmen are now far more Conservative than Englishmen. Religious feeling is strong, but it requires galvanizing to become active. Party politics alone are perennial, and with their imperial and transatlantic connections can cause widespread disorder. The Anglo-Saxon legislator can only sigh that the Celt, like the poor, is ever with him. There seem to be only two methods of dealing with the Celt. Either to recognize him as an element, untransformable and inconvertible indeed, but acceptable on his own merits into the national life; or else to adopt the good old German way of reckoning him the enemy, untransformable into German shape, inconvertible to the "good old German God," whether it be Thor or Luther for the moment, and therefore to be treated as Welsh-trash!

The conflict of Celtic and Teutonic folk runs through the submerged history of the Continent as well as of the British Isles. Lord Acton wrote pregnantly that the Celts supplied the material and the Teutons the impress of history. The story of every Celtic country is the story of opposition and reaction to the Teuton driving-power. Frank upon Gaul produced the French, as Saxon upon Brython produced the English, in each case after Romanization had smoothed the way. In later times Gaelic Highlander coalesced with Lowland Teuton to form the modern Scotch. The Celt fought a rearguard action seaward before he was absorbed in the plains or crannied in the hills. Like some dreamful *Athanasius*, and as deathless as the name implies, the Celt stood at bay against the world (*contra mundum*). King Arthur by Severn Sea, Owen Glendower and Cadwallader on the marches of the Wye, and later the clan chieftains of Scotland and Ireland, fought the same stubborn fight, and as each passed from the hopeless field an imaginative following canonized them and their memory and looked to their

the New Scene

Second Coming. Disaster has proven a surer halo than success to the Celtic hero, and his cause is never really lost, for it always remains a cause. A cause is only lost when engulfed in the achievement of its own success. The determination of the Celt to cling to his cause accounts for the resistance to the Roman Empire and to the Teutonic system no less, for intractability to Norman feudalism and to Anglo-Saxon constitutionalism. He only asked leave to hold his own. He adopted natural rather than political boundaries. He set rivers and at last the sea between him and his enemy. He piled his bourne with mountains like the broken-hearted Titan that he was, and became the "mountainy man" of Western Europe. The rivers he had named knew him no more. Once he had kept watch upon the Rhine, the divider of German and Gaul. He crept behind the Tamar in Cornwall and the Wye in Wales. He slipped beyond Barrow and behind Shannon in Ireland. The Shannon was the last ditch between the Celt and the Saxon. The famous phrase used in the *Times*, during the Famine, to the effect that the Celt was going with a vengeance and would soon be as scarce on the banks of the Shannon as the Redskin on the banks of the Mississippi, was one that burnt itself into Irish memory. It was an expensive trope of Macaulayese, for hardly a week or month passes that it is not cited in some Irish paper in some part of the world. With great bitterness of heart the Celt saw his rivers taken from him as he betook himself to the hills. He was not the original aggressor, but he became everywhere the Highland harrier of the Lowlands he believed to be rightfully his. There are Ulster counties where to this day the racial and agricultural strata exactly coincide.

When the Celt refused to become subjected to the Saxon he fell under his opprobrium. The master race sought every plea to defend itself from the unforgetfulness of the dispossessed. The old catch, "Taffy was a Welshman, Taffy was a thief," was the Teutonic song of contempt, adding insult to injury. The Celt was perpetually arraigned for trying to recover, by lawless ways

The Celt, the Saxon, and

indeed, what had been his own. The Irish Land War was perhaps the final historical instance. But in the war of words as well as as of deeds the Celt was at the disadvantage. It was not until the Celt had learnt the tongue of the Saxon that he could begin his advance to equality.

In the British Isles the Anglo-Saxon invaded not only the territory but the imagination of the Celt, with happy result in literature at least. Even the continuous Border scuffles bred the English ballad, while the Norman troubadour collected the material of Romance in the guard-fortresses of Wales. Out of this the Teutonic impulse wrought the legends of King Arthur and Sir Percival. Tennyson's *Idylls of the King* and Wagner's *Parsifal* must always remain supreme examples of the power of the dominant race to build with Celtic material. The Celt had fancy but no architectonic power in song or stone. Shakespeare wrote one Celtic drama, *Macbeth*, and severely libelled his hero, but he never brought out the racial contrast except in the famous scene between Percy Hotspur and Owen Glendower in *King Henry the Fourth*. For the moment he made the Celtic temperament and Saxon practically antagonists. Glendower, the Welsh mystic, believes nature is in supernatural affinity with his race. He boasts of the portents and the earthquake attending his birth, which the unimaginative Hotspur attributes to a kind of colick in the earth, and at last interrupts Glendower's mystical musings with "I think there's no man speaks better Welsh; I'll to dinner." When the Celt proclaims "I can call spirits from the vasty deep," the Saxon queries "But so can I; but will they come?" Glendower falls back upon the harp and poetry of his race, but Hotspur would rather "be a kitten and cry mew," and is bored to anger with "the dreamer Merlin and his prophecies."

The influence of the Celt in English religion, the Celt in English politics, the Celt in English literature would afford a fascinating monograph. True to the Evangelical paradox, Christianity has proved gladiatorial rather than pacific between Celt and Saxon. Antique antagonisms

the New Scene

became the fibre of religious fervour. Montalembert saw sorrowfully enough that Celt and Saxon "were destined by an unhappy mystery to tear one another in pieces even before religion divided them." The Celtic and Roman ecclesiasts settled their early disputes, but the rivalry of witness and whisper between Celt and Saxon never abated in the courts of Rome. Canterbury claimed dominion over the See of St. David's in Wales and the See of St. Patrick in Ireland, while York eyed the primacy of St. Andrew's in Scotland. Irish and Scotch were ever praying the Pope not to lend "too credulous an ear to the reports of our English enemies." The Pope came to recognize the independence of the Celtic Churches from the Primacy of the Angle long before the latter was associated with Anglicanism. St. Augustine's prophecy that the Saxons would overcome the Welsh was the beginning of a feud which lingers in the broils of Disestablishment. The English Catholics failed to help Wales to keep the Faith as the English Anglicans later failed to impose theirs. It is instructive that Sir John Rhys attributes the failure of the Salvation Army in Wales to its "Saxon methods."

When politics fall into the seas of the old Celto-Saxon feud, statesmen face waves instead of ripples. It is sad how many English careers have been wrecked by the waves of the Irish Question. It has always been a dire responsibility to play on the submerged tides of the old feud, but it is a responsibility which has been freely taken on both sides. A wild host of memories, however interesting as history or innocuous as tradition, may be roused and not easily hived. The subconsciousness of history may be actuated by a purely passing motive. From the tenements of the dead and outworn ossuaries, dire and distressful directions may be given to thought and action. It is not well even for electoral success to rouse the passion-music of the Celt as an excuse for drowning it with Saxon drums. When the symphony of the past is played in Ireland, it evokes not the blessed antiphon *Requiescant in pace*, but a crescendo for which we must

The Celt, the Saxon, and

borrow the most vivid of human cries drawn from the present war. *Debout les morts!* In Celtic countries the dead are easily marshalled. Irish cemeteries give up their dead on slighter excuse than any graveyards in Christendom. The dead who died for Ireland await the hope of an unhappy Insurrection as well as of a blessed Resurrection. Their final and peaceful laying to rest should be no less an object of Saxon policy than of Celtic devotion.

How often has the Celtic strain cloven English politics! It has been pointed out that in the crises of English history, the Wars of the Roses, the Civil strife and the Revolution, the division corresponded more or less to the old lines of Celt and Saxon. The men of the West and the North against the East and the South. Curiously enough the nicknames of the two great English parties, Whig and Tory, bear witness to the Celt struggling against the central Government. The Irish "Tories" were doubtless outlaws, but they were mostly Catholic gentlemen who had been dispossessed and set adrift on the hillsides. Their name, as Lord Acton, staunch Whig as he was, took pleasure in recalling, was first bestowed by Titus Oates on his political opponents. The least Irish sympathy was made a ready reproach and slogan in the fierce politics of the day. The original "Whigs" were the Scotch Covenanters who suffered persecution for faith disagreeable to the central power. Both Whigs and Tories took to the hills. Both of their names were given in derision to English parties. As Old Mortality complained, "Carnal men have assumed that triumphant appellation." After the "Dutch" Revolution in England the Celt stalked moodily in the Jacobite background. The Scotch struck twice in vain for the Celtic dynasty. The Irish lay moaning Erse under penal fetters. It was the Nineteenth Century that brought the Celt into flowing exercise of the English tongue and vigorous practice of English politics. Daniel O'Connell and Feargus O'Connor, the Catholic and the Chartist prophet, were portents of the new interference. The Anglo-Saxon world has had ever since to deal with a problem as

the New Scene

fruitful in strife as in progress, the intrusion of the Celt into the forms and ordinances of Government proper to the former originally. Throughout the Anglo-Saxon world Irish Celts have entered into political life, straining and exceeding the forms according to the conservative view, improving them according to the democratic.

II

O'Connell was the first modern Celt. He adapted his native genius to the English system, which he influenced no less than his own country. O'Connell could hardly leave the English Parliament a sadder, but he left it a wiser, assembly than when he first entered it. He had no wish to recall a Celtic system from the vasty deep. On the contrary, he shed his Celtic speech and demanded back the Assembly of Eighteenth Century squires as the symbol of Irish nationality. He stirred the forces of all modern democracy and recreated, if he did not debase, the standard of political speech. Modern speakers learned of him; for his style became the successful style, and the period gave way to the epithet as logic went to seed in bright phrases. As journalism succeeded the pamphlet so a mixture of wit and vilification supplanted ordered speech. The older generation could only shiver when O'Connell called Wellington a "stunted corporal" or Disraeli "the lineal descendant of the impenitent thief." But his comparison of Peel's smile to "the silver plate on a coffin" would have tickled Shakespeare. The Twentieth Century found the Celt prominent and even predominant in the politics of Anglo-Saxon countries. The Irish became a problem as well as a power in Washington no less than Westminster. In America they performed the spadework of politics and earned their reward. Their influence was not as evil as commonly represented. Bryce admits that the Irish were blamed for what went wrong in the great American cities as the cat is commonly blamed in the kitchen. Clan feeling might not always allow the Constitution to stand in the way of personal friendship, but on the whole the American found that it

The Celt, the Saxon, and

saved trouble and did not destroy the State to relinquish politics to the Irish. The situation in England was more piquant where opposition caused a distinct Irish Party, and the more unbalanced element, so to speak, came to hold the balance.

Against the Celtic advance in modern politics stands the failure to win social equality in the British Isles. This is due to the ancient and misleading contempt of race for race, despite the brilliances of accepted individuals. The Victorian Era was much pervaded by the spirit of what we may call the Great Teutonic Myth, now that "Teutonic" has taken the place of "Celtic" as the best abused word in the language. The Myth was once a working creed as stern as Islam. In a mind like Cromwell's it could become a superstition driving him to massacre the infidel Celt in the name of a Teutonic God. The cautious and colourless Gardiner admits that "Cromwell sought to thrust the responsibility for the slaughter upon God." Of his famous Irish manifesto, Gardiner adds that "as a contribution to Irish History nothing could be more ludicrously beside the mark than those burning words." Nevertheless it was Teuton Gospel of a kind. In its mythic form the old sentiment was strangely kept alive by modern historians.

With ponderous ecstasy Carlyle, and with sentimental inaccuracy Kingsley, propagated the theme and prophesied ill of Gaul and Latin whenever they withstood or corrupted the godliness of the Teuton. Even the republican Motley let out in his Dutch history such a secretion of racial spleen as, "The German in his simplicity had raised himself to a purer belief than that of the superstitious Gaul . . . the purity of their religion was soon stained by their Celtic neighbourhood." True religion and chosenness were predicated of one race, superstition and unfitness of another. In his *Roman and Teuton*, Kingsley piously claimed God as the Teuton General in the past, just as he hailed modern Teutonism in Garibaldi (bold warrior) struggling against the Papal *bête-noire* of the northern people.

the New Scene

The Celtic peoples, the French and the Irish, were pilloried together. English historians were never tired of ringing the changes on these. The more pro-Teuton a writer was, as a rule the more anti-Catholic and anti-Celtic was his pen. Carlyle, the deifier of Frederick the Great, cast corresponding scorn on Ireland. It is not necessary to quote his unholy shriek over the dead O'Connell. His visit to Ireland in the 'Forties brought only one bitter conclusion: "Remedy for Ireland? To cease generally from following the Devil." This of a country that had given up all to follow God! Froude, whose pretty pen made libretto to Carlyle's hoarse tones generally, added on his own account to the literary hate between the two countries by his *English in Ireland*. Herbert Paul, his biographer, explains without excusing the attitude he took—between him and the Celt there was a mysterious impassable barrier. They had not the same fundamental ideas of right and wrong. They did not in very truth worship the same God. This, perhaps, probes the modern trouble to the root.

The War of 1870 was an interesting test. Englishmen who could sympathize with Ireland in spite of Fenianism could be fair to France in spite of Napoleon III. Those who hated Ireland in religion cheered Germany in politics. Carlyle saluted Germany as the "Queen of the Continent" to be; and we are not surprised to find Lecky, the Irish historian, remonstrating with Carlyle's comparison of France with Sathanas, and of her opponent with an Archangel. "My own view of it," wrote Lecky, "is not his, and I am a little sceptical about the resemblance between St. Michael and Count Bismarck!" Lecky, with Green, had been the fairest of historians to the Irish, and we naturally find Green disapproving of Freeman's desire to "cut up the whole Gal-welshry (Celtic France) into bits as a standing menace to Dutchland." As Green said to Freeman: "You hate France more than you love liberty." Freeman's Teutonism showed itself in his famous wish for America: "This would be a grand land if only every Irishman would kill

The Celt, the Saxon, and

a negro and be hanged for it." Neither Green nor Lecky justified the entry of France into the war; but, like Joan of Arc, they had pity on the *bel royaume de France*. But the old school of history had no pity on the Celt, and they forced English opinion against the French. The old school passed before the scrupulous pens of men like Acton and Bury, but their mantle was caught up and manipulated by a cosmic conjurer. Houston Chamberlain laid his *Foundations of the Nineteenth Century* to buttress a Teutonic world. All that was well-bred and warlike, inventive or mystical, in Northern Europe, was attributed to the Teuton. The Celt was lightly dismissed as his "elder brother in the west," or shall we say the rough draft, the botched masterpiece, which fell from the hands of an evolutionist Creator before He succeeded in making the superior race—the Teuton!

There is no need to deny the great contribution of the Teutonic peoples to civilization. But it must not be forgotten how often and how fruitfully they crossed with the Celt. France, under her Latin polish, remained more Gallic than Frankish, as England under her Norman discipline stayed more Saxon than British. The nations proved to be different mixtures of constituent races. The more Celtic a West European country was, the less German it became. History is not solved by speaking of inferior and superior races, still less by alluding to some as backward and to others as advanced. It is meaningless to call the Anglo-Saxon superior to the Celt, with the easy deduction that the original German is superior to both. Nor is an Irishman merely an unprogressive Englishman, any more than the Germans are hitting a mark in calling Englishmen decadent (Celtized) Germans. At great and slow cost real and fruitful fusion has taken place between Celt and Saxon in Great Britain. Even in Ireland there has been as much fusion of blood as in Scotland, but fusion of sentiment and of political sympathy is peculiar to the latter. Three generations of English readers of Sir Walter Scott have sympathized with the Nationalist struggle of Scotland while detesting

the New Scene

its bare memory in Ireland. Ireland needs the Scotch example on both sides of the Boyne.

A policy of respect and clear dealing satisfied the Scotch, and Sir Walter's warning was heeded : " If you unscotch us, you will find us mischievous Englishmen." Unfortunately there was no Irish Scott to bring the Gaelic glensmen and the Anglo-Saxon palesmen together. No master hand came to reconcile and solder the twin traditions which fell among the propagandists. How disconcerting it would have been in modern Scotland had the picturesque Jacobite societies been organized on a Fenian model and the Clans, which the law recognizes for social and traditional purposes, been driven to emulate the American-Irish Clan na Gael ! Nor would Scotch feeling have been improved, if nervous and embittered loyalists in the Lowlands had annually celebrated the battle of Culloden as a victory over their fellow-countrymen and played " See the Conquering Hero comes " (which Handel actually composed for that melancholy occasion) in honour of the Butcher Cumberland as a Protestant deliverer. Common sense prevented Drum-mossie Moor being made as bitter to the Highlanders as Boyne Water became to the Irish. After the Reformation, and especially after the Union, England learnt to deal with Scotland as an equal ; but Ireland, both before and after her Union, was graded as a subjugated inferior. With considerable insight Dr. Arnold described the Irish defeat at Athenree as a curse, and the Scotch victory at Bannockburn as a blessing : " Had the Irish remained independent they might afterwards have been united to us as Scotland was, and had Scotland been reduced to subjection it would have been another curse to us like Ireland." England's historical mistake towards Ireland has been one of wrong premise, false attitude, and blundering approach. As Lord Huntly said of the proposed match between Mary of Scots and Edward VI of England, " he liked the match, but liked not the manner of wooing." The result was that Lecky could never write in his Irish History the golden words in which he:

The Celt, the Saxon, and

described the Teuto-Celtic fusion in Scotland: "The distinctive beauty and great philosophic interest of that character spring from the very singular combination it displays of a romantic and chivalrous with a practical and industrious spirit. In no other nation do we find the enthusiasm for loyalty blending so happily with the enthusiasm for liberty."

Historical mistake sows the seed of political crime. A host of witnesses on either side testify with blood and ink that the fusion has been mismanaged in Ireland from the first: "To the mistaken policy pursued by England is due the fact that the King's Realm is no richer for Ireland," confesses Lord Dunraven. Yet Irish history contains a succession of men who have striven to undo the mistake, and have generally but effected their own undoing instead. Again and again a glimmering of wiser and juster counsel has been fogged by greater darkness than before. Henry VIII, curiously enough, was once anxious to reconcile native pride with his personal suzerainty by a course of studied and not despicable shifts or "amiable persuasions," as he called them. In bluff wise Henry Tudor wished to take over Nationalist Ireland. Celtic chiefs were to be made Earls instead of outlaws. The Defender of the Faith might have also become defender of the Faithful. The King's genial experiment stood in contrast to the coercion policy favoured by his Deputy Surrey. Under Elizabeth, Sir John Perrot effected a "Composition of Connaught" which could be called a fair compromise between Celt and Anglo-Norman. His hand was heavy, but it fell upon both nations with impartial severity, with the result that he was recalled and accused of anti-English policy. The Irish followed him to the Tower with sincere grief.

In later times the type of enlightened official crossed the Irish scene from time to time. Fitzwilliam and Carnarvon in the Vice-Royalty, Thomas Drummond and George Wyndham in the Chief Secretaryship, were shining and unforgettable examples. There need have

the New Scene

been no Rebellion in 1798 had Fitzwilliam remained in Dublin. Had Drummond lived a few years, the horrors of the Famine and the aftermath of revolt would have been averted. Later, Carnarvon was allowed to throw away his career like a political Falkland ; and in our own memory George Wyndham piteously no less. A generous attention to Drummond's rejoinder to the Tipperary magistrates, that "property has its duties as well as its rights," might have saved Ireland from her Land War. Drummond was a vice-regal treasure as well as a popular model in conduct and foresight. He won native confidence by showing impartiality as among white men. He was equally willing to suppress the Orange rowdy and the Nationalist rebel. He disturbed Saxon sentiment by creating Celtic policemen. He made the Duke of Leinster and Daniel O'Connell meet each other. He died on the brink of perilous times, when Ireland needed him more than she did even O'Connell. His just spirit was recognized by a statue in Dublin and—mighty portent !—at his graveside stood the leader of the Irish people. The military forces have yielded a few grateful memories, but they have never been sustained. Sir Ralph Abercrombie's humanity in 1798, and his refusal to use a militia whom he described as a greater danger to their friends than their foes, found an echo in General Buller's conduct in Kerry. Even in the fierce 'eighties of the Nineteenth Century Mr. Healy could offer a tribute in a letter to Labouchere : "Buller is Soudanizing Kerry *à la Gordon*, so that, with the stoppage of evictions there, moonlighting is coming to an end." It has always required such a little stretch of imagination or generosity to win the Irish, just as a touch of hardness or shortsightedness has often plunged the popular emotion into the opposite direction. No measure should be taken in Irish affairs without inquiring whether it disturbs or levels the delicate equipoise between Celt and Saxon. At the same time the balance should not be left for ever to the disadvantage of the Celt.

The Celt, the Saxon, and

III

The antagonism of the Celt and the Saxon passes beyond the dead hand of the antiquarian, and even out of the livelier grasp of the politician, when considered in its results to World-politics. The Irish driven out of Ireland have become something between a lever and a leaven in every single part of the Empire. Never in the majority, they are always the strongest amongst minorities. The casting vote and the balance of political power comes to them by chance or by right. This is even more so in the United States, where dwell a majority of the whole race, estimated between twenty and thirty millions. The United States were originally an extension of the Anglo-Saxon world. The English Colonials with strong Irish backing (chiefly from Ulster) laid down the Great Republic on lines which have since been strained, though not sapped, by the incoming hordes from East Europe and West Asia. The Anglo-Saxon, the Irish, and to a lesser extent the German, have proved the most ready to assimilate Americanism. But, to the hordes of Slavs and Syriacs, America is little less than a golden caravanserai. Owing to them the tone of national consciousness has totally changed since the Civil War. The American "Melting Pot" has not yet yielded a corporate American nationality.

The Civil War was fought to its bitter end mainly by the three types, Anglo-Saxon, Irish, and German, whose survivors might have combined in time to come to produce an ideal American blending of the Celtic and Teutonic elements. But the Civil War cut very deep into the original stock. The Anglo-Saxon gentry of the South perished. No modern prosperity has made up for the loss of the old blood. The German and Irish have been reinforced by immigration in a way lacking to the Anglo-Saxon. He has fallen behind in a country which recognizes numbers, but not caste. In a book recently published in America, *The Passing of the Great Race*, Mr. Madison Grant says what is probably true enough: "If

the New Scene

the Civil War had not occurred these same men, with their descendants, would have populated the Western States instead of the racial nondescripts who are now flocking there." It has been those Western States which largely decided American attitude toward the present conflict. A matter of national honour is not likely to appeal except to the Celtic and Teutonic stocks of America. Of these the most vivid of Celtic and Teutonic strains, the Irish and the German, outnumber their fellow, the Anglo-Saxon. As Froude sorrowfully recognized, seven years after the Civil War, "the Anglo-Saxon power is running to seed." The life of equal opportunity, unhampered by privilege, has shown that there is no race-superiority between Aryan peoples in America. Influences and riches go to the numerous and industrious. While the law, language, and legislature can be called Anglo-Saxon, the Celtic leaven and the huge Foreign communities have undermined any English instinct except in social circles. The Irish have become, at any rate, as Americanized as the original colonists; and in another generation the Germans, who still retain their language, will follow suit. How far the original type is surviving is becoming doubtful. Perhaps Mr. Madison Grant concludes his volume a little pessimistically: "If the Melting Pot is allowed to boil without control, the type of native American of Colonial descent will become as extinct as the Athenian of the age of Pericles." Yet no Irish-American would wish to see the Anglo-Saxon as rare on the banks of the Hudson as the Redskin on the Mississippi. The Celt and the Saxon in America have recognized their kindred stock in the Aryan heritage. They have mixed in the professions and in every social circle, and in blood when religion would permit. It is in Ireland herself that the Irish have not received Aryan recognition.

The mistake of regarding the Irish as inferior at home has been extended into considering them negligible when scattered abroad. In spite of a generation of signs and warnings, England has never made any genuine political move or diplomatic advance towards the Irish-Americans,

The Celt, the Saxon, and

who are, in some ways, the deciding factor in an English-speaking world. Many Germans had left Germany with as bitter feelings as Irishmen had left Ireland, but Germany did not let the memory of 1848 fester among those who had cast the dust of the Fatherland off their shoes, as England let Irish memory of the same date encumber the Republic. Germany carried out a wise and secret policy, which made good her footing in the New World, until the reconciliation of Germany and her exiles was clinched by the triumphant visit of the Kaiser's brother. Friendly relations with the official world do not necessarily carry the cordiality of the political world as well. An Ambassador may hold his own in the Anglo-Saxon section without ever reaching the enormous Celtic strata. The tragedy is that he may not think it worth while to try to reach them. Late in time, indeed, we have an Irishman at the British Embassy. Whatever has been done to avert the outbreak of cyclonic bitterness, and whatever can yet be done to ameliorate Anglo-American relations in their Irish phase, Sir Cecil Spring Rice has done and can do. Through such differently situated men as he and John Redmond alone can England secure the open friendship of America. If the relations of England and America are ever to be sealed they must be sealed with the approval of Irishmen on both sides. The carelessness with which the Irish-German *entente* has been encouraged in America during the past twenty years bears bitter fruit. Excellent as the mixture of Irish and German blood may prove in the racial future of America, an Irish-German combination for international purposes cannot be altogether acceptable to Washington. It could have been countermined from Dublin, had Westminster and Washington taken wise counsel together when Secretary Hay, realizing how matters stood in 1899, wrote of Americans who would oppose "any treaty with England, no matter how advantageous to us, as a hostile act towards Ireland and Germany." American officials are probably not less anxious than Imperial ones to see the settlement of a question which is always liable

the New Scene

to affect their home politics without reference to the advantage of the country at large. This Irish influence runs stiller and deeper than any superficial examination would show. Few Governors of States, few elected Judges, or Representatives, or Senators, but have to feel and consider at some time the weight of the Irish vote, or at least the latent strength of Irish opinion. If they reckon the Irish Press and the professional Irish politicians as negligible, they know that Irish opinion is not. It runs in the marrow of the United States. It is the ever-ready force that strengthens her arm when she wishes to oppose England, and that slows her hand whenever it is proffered in friendship. Washington has never countenanced any direct Irish attack on England; and men like John Boyle O'Reilly have always been ready to carry through a statesmanlike bargain between Celt and Saxon. Though O'Reilly suffered penal servitude, he adopted a wise attitude in the most brilliant of Irish-American papers. In 1885, he wrote in the *Pilot*: "One magnanimous statesman in England, one leader with the wisdom and courage of genius, would solidify the British Empire to-day with a master-stroke of politics. Such a policy would silence the dynamiters and radicals, satisfy and gratify the Irish people throughout the world, strengthen the British Empire and make America thoroughly sympathetic." It is sad that this is the very cry which lovers of Ireland and would-be admirers of England feel compelled to reiterate to-day.

It has been said that Irish Nationalism stands between Ireland and the light of the world. It also stands between England and the love of the world. Envoy after envoy has found his work at Washington checked and chequered. The history of British diplomacy in the United States has been one long struggle against Irish influences in the dark. Sackville-West, whose every move was watched and foiled by an intensely active Fenian Party, actually took refuge, during the time of the Phoenix Park executions, on the Presidential yacht; and indirectly he owed, in the end, his abrupt dismissal to the force of Irish

The Celt, the Saxon, and

opinion. An indiscreet letter from his pen at election time gave the Irish Democrats a distinct breach of etiquette to work upon; and Cleveland handed Sackville-West his papers. It was an act of unprecedented rigour; but the Irish were strong enough to insist. The Parnellite Split, and the growing trust in Mr. Redmond, made matters easier for the British Embassy, though easy they can never be until Ireland is in charge of her own concerns.

Thus, for all practical purposes, and despite the better feeling engendered by the present occupants of the Embassy, the immemorial distrust felt by the Celt is once more to the fore in America, as it was during the Boer War. The intensified feeling of the Irish would not then permit President McKinley even to present a flag to the Anglo-American hospital ship *Maine*. The celebration of the Centenary of the Peace of Ghent and a hundred years' peace between England and America was largely discounted by Irish irritation over the situation in Ulster. A meeting in Carnegie Hall was broken up under German direction. Yet a settlement of the Irish Question would have cut the ground from under the feet of the extremists at any moment. The same levers were used which Davitt went over to America in 1897 to employ against the proposed Anglo-American Treaty. The Treaty was defeated in the Senate of the United States by Irish influences. It was a *riposte* to the Jubilee Coercion Act. In 1913, however anxious the friends of England might be to oblige her with an official expression of American friendship and possibly even alliance, Irish influences once more frustrated the endeavour on the ground that the Irish Question remained unsettled. The crisis in Anglo-American affairs came about with the war. England's weak spot in America was left uncovered. The Rising and the subsequent executions were all that were necessary to inflame it. The old feud of Celt and Saxon flared for a lurid moment through the Press of a Continent. Then were heard the shots that were heard round the world. As Lord Acton wrote of the Phoenix

the New Scene

Park murders, "the true moral of this catastrophe can never be made visible to the average Englishman." The bungled negotiations which followed did not assuage the bitterness. Then it became obvious why the cynical Bernstorff was the strongest anti-Home Ruler in the States, and why the generous wisdom of the British Ambassador shared the distress common to all Irishmen of good will.

Celt and Saxon had long been grappling with each other in the American arena. The prize was public opinion. In time of peace, English diplomatists could dally with the famous password that blood was thicker than water, but in the day of his supreme test the Anglo-Saxon needed American opinion and even American support behind him. The German was powerless to affect American opinion without the invaluable help of the Celt.

If the "Celt and the Saxon" was the oldest of feuds in British history it is also the last and latest. The Irish trouble has ceased to be merely a local sore or latent affliction. It has become a world-wide and pronounced irritation, which the past year has seen intensified in every limb of Empire. Gardiner once wrote of Anglo-Irish relations, that whereas "the English sovereigns had been confronted by a congeries of Irish tribes, the English Commonwealth was confronted by an Irish nation." To-day the British Empire is met and queried by a great and international brotherhood of Irish blood within and without her borders, upon whose undiminishing devotion to Ireland the sun never sets. Let none set aside as an obscure domestic quarrel the crisis that came simultaneously in the relations between England and Ireland as well as in the relations between America and England. Diplomats do not like to admit, and politicians for equally obvious reasons seek to conceal, the real heart of controversy between England and America. But the United States can no longer afford to be marooned, nor can England allow the vitality of the English-speaking body to be jeopardized by one of its members.

The United States can obviously look only for a friend

The Celt and the Saxon

whose world-politic would antagonize neither Canada nor Japan. There is only one European Power that can seal that alliance. And only the Celt-and-Saxon antagonism—a tradition and a habit rather than an actual incompatibility—blocks the way.

SHANE LESLIE.

HENRY, DUKE OF NORFOLK

EVEN those who had the best and most frequent opportunity of knowing and appreciating the high qualities of the late Duke of Norfolk will have noticed with something of a grateful surprise the universal praise of his life and character which his death called forth. It would not have been astonishing if such tributes had been uttered only by those with whom he had been in contact, social, religious, or political. But his career had clearly made a mark upon the public opinion of England, evoking an appreciation honourable in the noblest sense both to those who expressed it and to him whose career and personal qualities had compelled it. The English people recognize true merit, however modestly and unassumingly it may be manifested, and gladly give praise where praise is due.

There are many aspects of the life of the late Duke which claim the recognition and lasting gratitude of Catholics, and these have been set forth both from the pulpit and in the Catholic Press. His leadership, his loyalty to Church and State, his unbounded generosity, his quickly awakened sympathy, his unflinching toil in every good cause, all these and many other characteristics are a heritage and an example to every succeeding generation of English Catholics.

There is, however, one fact underlying and encompassing them all on which it may be useful, and not unfitting, to dwell at greater length, for it encloses a teaching with ever-present and all-important significance.

Those of us who travel from these shores and are brought into close contact with our fellow Catholics in other lands have often to face and meet the question: How comes it that the return of England to the ancient faith is comparatively so slow—what is the great obstacle to unity of religious belief in England?

Henry, Duke of Norfolk

It is recognized by those who put the question that the English are in essential instincts a religious people, that they reverence God; they respect the day specially dedicated to His service; they invoke Him on all public occasions; they accept His Will with resignation; and, pre-eminently among all the nations, they are ready to discuss matters of religion even as a topic of ordinary conversation.

It is seen, moreover, that for the most part there is no hostility to religious teaching as such, none of the fierce, clamorous, anti-dogmatic bitterness so often witnessed abroad. Rather there is indifference to definite religious teaching and an inclination to regard one religion as being as good as any other. A man may be Anglican or Non-conformist; he may pass to Judaism, Mahomedanism, or Buddhism. Beyond a mild astonishment at an unwonted change little comment will be evoked. But if he becomes a Catholic, fierce resentment not infrequently is the outcome; wills may be recast to exclude the renegade and his descendants. Whence comes this irrational, often unreasoning, discrimination? The answer to the question is at the same time the explanation of that which is, in our opinion, the main obstacle to the return of England, as a nation, to the allegiance of the Apostolic See. There is in most English minds an inability to comprehend how true loyalty to king and country are compatible with obedience, even in spiritual things, to a supreme authority that is exercised by one who may or may not be, and almost universally has not been, an Englishman. It is the clash between the spirit of nationalism and the claims of a universal Church. Englishmen think to become less English, if they be Catholic as well.

Like all the potent factors that so strongly sway our race, this instinctive feeling is not based on logic, it is not easily analysed, it appears in unexpected places and on most unlikely occasions. But there it ever is, and before many an one has been able to accept the faith of the truth of which his mind was already reasonably

Henry, Duke of Norfolk

convinced, he has to beat down and root out this lingering hesitation deeply imbedded in his English mind.

It is no new factor in the religious history of our country. It was in full life and vigour long before the great separations of the Sixteenth Century; it was skillfully exploited by kings and rulers for their own ends. It was the ever-present cause of the recurrent disputes between the Church in England and the Roman Curia, when, rightly or wrongly, spiritual authority was deemed to be overstepping the limits of its domain, and invading the temporal sphere of purely national concern.

Without this factor always hiddenly at work, Henry VIII could not with impunity have defied the Apostolic See. If it had been absent, the greatest weapon that Elizabeth had at her command would have been broken in her hands. It was this factor that doomed the imprudent enterprises of James II inevitably to failure. This determining influence is ever at work among us, unconfessed, unacknowledged, undiscovered by many even of those who are most completely beneath its sway. It is in many a case the first phantom to appear when the mind of a religious man begins to turn longingly towards Rome. It may be the last phantom to be stilled before he takes the final decisive step. It is a spectre evoked week by week in the extreme Protestant press; and it is usefully called forth, when occasion serves, by those who would fain hold themselves Catholics even though they have no link with Rome. Many minds are continually haunted by it, and but for it none would be more loyal or more devoted children of God's Holy Church.

How can it be overcome? Certainly not by pure logic or by reasoning. It is in truth a phantom and a spectre, and no ghost was ever put to flight by argument.

Such an influence, so strong a prepossession, can be evicted only by counter-influences, by object lessons so emphatically clear as to claim possession of men's minds no matter what intruders may resent their coming. Every true Catholic, loyal, because he is a Catholic, to both Church and State, to Pope and King; passionately loving

Henry, Duke of Norfolk

and serving the country where God has set his birth, and no less devotedly clinging to the divinely constituted spiritual authority of the Apostolic See; "giving to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's," and recognizing that our Lord has willed that in the spiritual sphere "there is neither Jew, nor Greek: there is neither bond, nor free: there is neither male, nor female"; every such Catholic is to his neighbours and in his own surroundings, however limited they may be, the best and fittest answer to the prejudices and fears and hesitations that beset their souls, when they think of the Catholic Church.

And where such a Catholic as this is set in a high place before the eyes of all, possessing rank and wealth and influence, and using all alike to serve God, and Church, and king and country, unceasingly, unstintingly, as the fulfilment of the same great moral duty, not a day can pass but that his life and work and character make it easier for some one to understand that, while in the things of this world our fatherland has a claim pre-eminent and insistent, in the things of God it is His Will that all the nations of the earth should be as one people.

Is it too much to say that to no one for three hundred years has it been given to do more for the dissipating of this lingering prejudice of our race than to the late Henry, fifteenth Duke of Norfolk? Truly he discharged his God-given task with unflinching earnestness and with a success of which we have some proof in the tributes that have been given to his memory. But it is the history of the future that will tell all that we in England owe to him on this account. May his memory and his example be a constant inspiration to those who with him have learnt to unite the Apostolic See of Rome and their native land of England in the same one unchanging love.

FRANCIS CARDINAL BOURNE,
ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.

SOME RECENT BOOKS

THE Irish University Acts of 1908 decreed that whatever sums of money might be provided for the new University, no part of them should be applied for "the provision or maintenance of any church, chapel, or other place of religious worship or observance" in connection therewith. Such restrictions, imposed by prejudice or injustice, could only, among a spirited people, stimulate efforts to evade them. In Cork, the building of the University College Chapel, dedicated to St. Finn Barr, Patron Saint of Cork, and built in the Hiberno-Romanesque style, provides for the first need of Catholic university life, a centre for the worship of God. It was further intended that this Chapel should call into new life the spirit and the work of the age when Irishmen built noble churches under the impulse of native genius. There was a happy confidence that such a building would win its way to the hearts of the ardent youth of to-day. These motives have been largely realized if we may judge by the evidence of photography and the written word in the delightful *Notes on the Building of the Honan Hostel Chapel* (Guy: Cork), by Sir John O'Connell. The book itself is something of a pioneer in Irish publishing; for it is both beautiful and austere. The revolution which Catholics in England have achieved in book-production is evidently to have its counterpart in Cork; and we shall expect the present volume to be taken as a model for many another Irish book even as, in London, great outside publishing firms have learned their lessons, particularly in the production of poetry, from the Catholic house in Orchard Street.

And the content of the book answers to its aspect. Just as a Catholic Bishop in the United States declared, on a great occasion, that a man can hardly have a home unless he owns the ground on which his house stands, so this little book asserts that no chapel can be so worthy as that which is built of the stone of the land wherein

Some Recent Books

it is set, and built too by the labour of the men who will pray in it. It should express the spirit of the place. And with the colour and the textures of its natural setting should be interwoven an idea of its own date. This has been done at St. Finn Barr's. The plan, the elevations, and the external materials are as old as history and nature can make them. The walling and the ashlar work are full of character; the thick joints justify themselves both in the dressed stone and the rubble work; they emphasize the structure and they give scale; in the outer walling they form an irregular but decorative diaper. In the colourless photograph, as we see it, the roofing material lacks character; the two pinnacles at the west end do not dwell in peace with their surroundings. The absence of a plinth to the building makes the structure as daring as the baseless columns of the Ducal Palace or the Parthenon. The happy thought in the design of the mosaic pavement, the stations in *opus sectile*, the elaboration of subject in the enamelled tabernacle, and the good drawing, allied with necessary convention, in the stained glass, show a conservative development of Hiberno-Romanesque and do indeed date the fortunate building: if the colour, the pot-metal glass, and the lead work are as good as the cartoons, these windows are (and this is an envying English architect's judgment), at the least, equal to any modern work.

The admirable needlework and appointments of the altar are, so to say, only commentaries on the building itself; they are buoys which mark the course of the current of the revival. The absence of an organ may have a significance on which it is perhaps too soon to rejoice: the predominance of that instrument and its accessories is one of the troubles of church-building. It would have been interesting if the mosaic floor had been illustrated. Its design is inspired by a Gaelic poem, and by the Canticle of the Three Children in which are sung the praises of God in His works. The pavement is part of the architecture of the building, and in this case blesses the Lord in His created works represented under the convention

Prostitution

imposed by marble tesserae. To the same rank belongs the western door or grille of wrought iron ; its position is as unusual as its design is original—it is a development on Celtic lines. Although the framework may be sufficiently strong, the remainder of the gate might have been wrought by a spider blacksmith—the construction and the ornament have not quite come to terms. Nevertheless, through this delicate grille will be seen a vision of restrained design in which simplicity of form and broad surfaces welcome and strengthen the glories of enamel and glass.

The Honan Hostel Chapel comes into being by the munificence of a Cork merchant family ; and that is another feature proper to its plan. If the great Middle-class in England has done nearly everything that is worth while in the arts, in literature, and in philanthropy, in Ireland, a country of increasing wealth, it is likely to be relied on more and more to mark with majesty the land that bore it. True love of the Beauty of God's house never did run smooth in Ireland. The jade Beauty has been a jilt here, there, everywhere, till people almost turned their backs in despite on her. To church-builders let us say in her regard what a poet said to the eighteenth-century painters who had fallen out with Nature : " Go find her, kiss her, and be friends again." Cork, ever renowned for its gallantry, has set the happy fashion.

" **A**WAY with Mary, Mother of Sorrows, and let us hail the return of Venus, Mother of Joys ! " Gabriele d'Annunzio—he who dared take for his own the name of the Angel of the Annunciation—thus pervertingly invoked Venus. And Venus heard. She *has* come again—in Venereal Disease ; her very name in it—Mother of Sorrows unspeakable, destroyer of holy innocents even. These be faltering words of things too foul in fact for utterance, and we bring ourselves to print them only by way of welcome to the warnings of a little book by " M. F." called, quite plainly, *Prostitution* (King & Son). It is issued by the Catholic Social Guild with an approving

Some Recent Books

Foreword by the Archbishop of Liverpool, and it outlines the history of Prostitution—among the Jews, in the early Christian centuries, in the Middle Ages, and in modern times, even ours. Most important of all—indeed the justification of the rest—is a chapter on Venereal Disease, “by J. F.,” formerly Resident Medical Officer in the London Lock Hospital, a place, one supposes, in which that medical officer—he or she—had his or her complete Purgatory.

Prostitution, with State recognition in Roman civilization, was thought, even by St. Augustine, to be an institution offering a necessary safety-valve to corrupt society. St. Thomas Aquinas, it seems, was with him. But St. Alphonsus and nearly all modern theologians have the developed executive sense that would refuse it such recognition. Legislation, for and against, fluctuated in England with the feeling of the centuries. Mediæval municipalities and even Universities “farmed brothels for profit, and there is evidence of Bishops even being landlords of such places!” A row of brothels near London Bridge, licensed by the Bishop of Winchester in 1161, paid at least this tribute to chastity—“they were closed on Saints’ days and Sundays, and forbidden to married men and the clergy.” On this the author tolerantly says: “In the then state of social science it need not have jarred on the Christian sense of a Bishop, the father of his people and part legislator for them, that he should have been the landlord of brothels, provided that, as Bishop, he furthered the reclamation of the inmates. Somewhere in that small city they must live, or suffer banishment, which was tantamount to final social perdition.”

Perhaps. But there’s a much misquoted maxim that comes poignantly to mind. And these bizarre happenings may be usefully remembered to-day, mainly because some people still object to the State’s attempt to cope with venereal disease. That, they say, gives State recognition to vice, and lessens the evils which God permits in punishment of it. Then in punishment of whom? Of young wives, with their clean flesh rotted? Of

Prostitution

the multitude of babies born blind, and paralysed, and idiotic as the result of their father's fall? As well say that the murder or maiming of his children by a drunkard should be passed over by the State as part of the penalty of Heaven on excess in strong drink!

It is a relief to read the wise Foreword of the Archbishop of Liverpool. Where others sensitively put initials only—and have a true courage in even that—the Archbishop, as his office demands, braves the association of his name with a thing that is loathsome. He speaks of disease—and we remember that he speaks from Liverpool, with the horrors of a vast seaport to inflame him—"which threatens not only the physical vigour, but even the very existence of the English race, involving, as it does, innocent and guilty in one common catastrophe." Of the Public Bodies, Royal-Commissioned to cope with it, the Archbishop says: "Not a few Catholics are members of these bodies. As loyal citizens they cannot hold aloof. And whilst it is a matter of urgency to deal directly and immediately with disease, it would be little short of trifling with a subject of overwhelming importance not to make some attempt to deal with its root-cause. Catholics may help to give the death-blow to an opinion held from the time of Luther—the supposed impossibility for the generality of men to control the sex-appetite. Moreover, Catholics are the more bound to see that no wife becomes the victim of a devilish corruption because Catholics cannot prescribe for her the full remedy of divorce."

It was before the purging war that Gabriele d'Annunzio thus profaned Our Lady's name and his borrowed own. We will not bear it too bitterly against the altered man he has perhaps become. Let him make the moral restitution which in the brave order of battle has been his in the ranks of our allies. Mr. Bernard Shaw says somewhere that only saints have the full capacity for joy; and surely if he ever visited an Irish convent the laughter of nuns (think of it!) still echoes in his ears. D'Annunzio, too, must have listened while it rang like a gay sacring-bell

Some Recent Books

behind many a *grille* in Italy. But in hospitals of the armies in the field a different sound has assailed his ears: the groans of disabled men whom the enemy had not touched, the victims of that very Venus he had invoked. Nor should he rest in his restitution before he has written his best to secure for every mortal mother that the fruit of her womb may indeed be blessed.

LITERARY criticism has become overwhelmingly able, complex, devoted, keen. One man sits within the mind of another; and, in so much as two fine minds require more explanation and exact more understanding than one, a book of the most modern criticism becomes hard as well as extremely interesting reading. But this is not Mr. John Freeman's way of studying his authors in *The Moderns* (Robert Scott). He contemplates the work before him, keeping his own place and using his perception and his insight without effort. While so much modern criticism works in order to find out, Mr. Freeman works to understand. His understanding is fine throughout, his insight at its best in the study of Coventry Patmore's poetry. Readers, too, should turn to his pages for a valuable estimate of Mr. Bernard Shaw; and, rather than mar that essay by quoting from it, we will here give a brief summary of our own estimate of that writer and of his principal, though commonly overlooked, characteristic.

The most complete and fundamental of all vulgarities is this: a pleasure in unmasking, or in detecting, or in disproving, any virtue that has claimed, or for which has been claimed, or to which has been attributed, sanctity. A couple of instances need not detain us long. Let us take St. George. There has been a sort of satisfaction in many a heart—in many a modern heart—at the thought that a man named George, revered in simple ages as a Saint, was in fact a fraudulent bacon-provider and not a Saint. In the same hearts has doubtless lurked a little disappointment that came with the better information that there was one George the bacon-man, and another

The Moderns

George the Christian martyr, patron of Genoa (where his beautiful Gothic hall stands by the port-side), and, through our amity with Genoa, of England. Again, when Turner lowered the tone of one of his pictures on the Academy walls because its brilliance quenched another man's work hung next to it, nobody was found to believe that he thus did so, except only Ruskin. This is not any devilish preference for evil thinking, it is merely a vulgar form of knowing better, a strutting incredulity, a boast of sharpness, and of clear sight of human things and what may be looked for from mankind.

If that vulgarity is very specialized, there are, in fact, two incidents to account for this dishonouring national possession. One is obviously the reaction against the reverence towards Saints that has followed the Reformation, and has lasted. The other is the small education and the popular manners of the Nonconformist preacher as he seems to have been in Dickens's days. The dear Dickens never delighted in mere disbelief of goodness, but he did delight, more perhaps than is noble, in the ridicule and the exposure of the hypocrite. There is Pecksniff, there is Stiggins, there is Chadband. Thackeray has his Reverend Charles Honeyman. It is too true that English literature has more joy in hypocrites than is to be found elsewhere, Molière's great example notwithstanding. To refute the Saint, to ridicule the hypocrite, has kept our national baser humour (for the Saint) and our saner humour (for the hypocrite) busy. It is perhaps worth noting that a book by Mr. Clodd, recently published, was decorated by a drawing of a "native" missionary, clad in slight garments and a top hat, holding a Bible and a gampish umbrella, disapproving of the bathing of British sailors in the South Seas on the Sabbath. Mr. Clodd cannot suspect how immeasurably more ignominious is the man who "faked" this cheap joke than that missionary would be if he existed. But the missionary—not as a hypocrite, but as a busybody—has for many a year been the object of this cheaper national humour.

Hypocrites, real and imaginary, apart, the Saints now

Some Recent Books

for some centuries, as far as they have received any attention, have been nationally disowned. They are suspected in general, in particular denied. This was enough until the present time. It is not sufficient now. The profound vulgarity of Mr. Bernard Shaw's soul—and we are charging him not with pure evil but solely with ignobility—goes further. No more need be said: he tracks, he detects, he handles, he revises, he exposes—Christ.

In attributing to Mr. Freeman the work chiefly of understanding his authors, we have not intended to represent him as a mere explainer of the writings he has so well understood. He understands in order not only to applaud but to question, to withstand, and to refute, not rashly, but with a peculiarly grave responsibility of thought. It is precisely the *irresponsibility* of Mr. Hardy in creating a much more than probable sum of misery for his heroine, Tess, and in accusing an ironical Immortal for her creation and her fate, that Mr. Freeman rebukes with admirable logic. The belief that there is over us a malignant purpose or Providence is, as he protests, "not only dismaying but disabling." Who would be so heartless or such a fool as to accept any happiness in life, or continued life itself, from such a hand? It is the doctrine, nevertheless, that Mr. Hardy wrote a book to promulgate; he strained the facts of life beyond nature, beyond chance, beyond, as it were, justice to things as they are, in order to carry that dogma. It was such a dogma as any man with a human heart, holding it, would have locked his mouth in daily talk to hold it dumb, would not have used genius and art in a novel to proclaim it, except only in the hope that man and woman on earth would hasten to die, childless. But is it a human heart that feels the griefs of the world so little as to make them incredibly more in a story, using every chance to that end, and yet denying chance and ascribing all the agony to a celestial irony? And the author of *Tess* is the Mr. Hardy who, at the beginning of the present war, wrote a fine marching poem, and its purport was that right was to

Men of Letters

win because it was right. The novel was written to insist that wrong would win because it was wrong. Which way lies good faith? It is a strange fact that except Mr. Freeman we know of no critic of eminence, no critic with readers, no critic at all, who has thought the purpose of Mr. Hardy's two novels, *Tess* and *Jude*, worth facing.

In his exclusively literary judgment Mr. Freeman is apt to be too generous. Henry James and Mr. Bridges receive the *benefices* of this impetuosity. But in pure literature as well as in philosophy he is always interesting, and writes throughout such admirable English as leaves us wondering how certain sentences of Henry James's passed the challenge of his eye.

DIXON SCOTT went to Gallipoli in the beginning of October, 1915, and died after three weeks. To those who used to follow his work week by week as it appeared, and who never laid aside articles of his without a sense of expectation of those that were still to come, it is difficult to re-read them in *Men of Letters* (Hodder & Stoughton), without that useless sense of expectation still arising. But this book, with Mr. Max Beerbohm's well-inspired Introduction, makes a perfect record of Dixon Scott's rare qualities. He had just that balance of power, between feeling and thinking, that is necessary in criticism. He was not the inarticulate critic, dazed with a sense of blessing, who can feel only; nor the cool critic, unmoved and unmoving, who can think much more than he can feel. His sensibility was always the preliminary to the soundest sense.

Whether the average critic is good or bad, his works generally have this drawback—they are not truly his own; they are young for whom he is not responsible, whose origin is due to someone else; the critic is like a nurse compared with a mother. His work not being purely impulsive, he expresses more than the natural instincts of his mind, which did not demand to express itself thus, and is merely suiting the occasion. The ordinary reviewer, at any rate, even after pronouncing the most conscientious

Some Recent Books

opinions, may be left with the feeling that he has played someone slightly false—not his author, not his reader, but himself. He has imposed on himself opinions as a child sticks flowers into his garden that have no root there. He has a sense of more profusion without than within. To what extent may a critic escape from the ignominy which Burne-Jones, for instance, considered to be associated with this art? In a passage in one of his letters, Burne-Jones speaks with dislike of men whose work depends on other men's work—is parasitic. That such a judgment does not cover the ground we know by the excitement and surprise and humility without which it is impossible to read Dixon Scott—excitement which only work of imagination and originality could produce. About all the contemporary authors treated in this book, he writes, indeed, rather as if they were characters he had invented for a novel, whom he must intimately expose, and who must act consistently throughout the eventful plot. What he does to Shaw and James and Barrie and Kipling is to invent them more than to criticize them. His theories about their art entail his constructing their very personalities again from the beginning; and so he builds them up, and fills in the gaps, and makes sure that the thing holds together. It is this element of inventive analysis which makes him often seem less like a critic expounding his theory in regard to some writer than like a novelist at work on a subtle and difficult character. In any case, the result is lively, shrewd and brilliant writing, full of alert humour. Take his description of the distress endured by the first æsthetic admirers of Kipling when he became popular. "Think of Mr. Roger Fry's chagrin if we made a popular favourite of Matisse!" Or his theory that it was to overcome a natural meekness that Kipling affected the "hot-blooded topics and the *sang-froid* tone" of his tales. Kipling wrote with a drawl, for "one of the most effective ways of out-Heroding Herod is to yawn wearily when the head is brought in." In the charming essay on Barrie he describes *Quality Street* as "part of the Great North Road half-way between Thrums and Kensington

English Literature

Gardens. And down it the discerning eye detects with a thrill a small shy figure pounding determinedly south. . . . There is a certain red light in his eye that betrays him. It is the author of *Sentimental Tommy* running to write *The Little White Bird*." And the reason for the 1815 period for *Quality Street*: "When he wrote grown-up modern English, the critics complained that it was stilted. Well, in Georgian days, seemingly, words always walked on little stilts: and so his own would pass muster there perfectly."

In Dixon Scott's private letters his critical sense could more easily abandon itself to one expression—that of praise, for which he had a genius indescribably true and simple and tender. The printed essay had to contain a challenge or a theory, a remorseless thrusting aside of the writer who seemed to be, to discover the writer who was. But in his letters he felt so much that sometimes he could hardly stop to think. Perhaps the purest criticism, like purest religion, is praise; and to Dixon Scott praise was the first instinct of his heart. And what in print was weighed and explained, in his letters was simply impulse and tenderness, so that, in writing to an author about a new book, he could speak of it as "my pride and my joy." That he gave so much, before he gave his life, makes that end on board a hospital-ship in the Mediterranean a fitting and harmonious thing, however much sadness such fittingness may have. What happened on that burdened ship as it left Gallipoli loses its violence if it was only the exchange of praise of life for praise of death.

THE two final volumes (XIII and XIV) of *The Cambridge History of English Literature* come from the Cambridge University Press, and with the editorial names of Ward and Waller of Peterhouse to commend them. With no limit to our pride in English literature, we may, for the purposes of this Review, specialize on the Catholic Men of Letters on their Roll. Taken by this test—which, though a restricted, ought to be a repre-

Some Recent Books

sentative one—we are obliged to say of these volumes that they travesty what they set out to teach.

From such an authoritatively issued survey of our later literature we should ask at the outset a sense of proportion, a certain relation between a writer's merits and the space in which they are set forth. Where Charles and Frederick Tennyson, under arbitrary escort of their great brother, have a chapter to themselves, where Adam Lindsay Gordon and Arthur Hugh Clough have similar dignities, we should not expect Patmore, and Francis Thompson, or even Aubrey de Vere (to say nothing of non-Catholics like T. E. Brown and Henley and R. L. S.) to be hustled among "Lesser Poets" into a sort of pauper's sepulchre. And inside that dismal vault of Mr. George Saintsbury's undertaking we encounter disproportions that must rank even as abortions. Patmore has half, and Thompson one-third, of the space accorded to Mary E. Coleridge—Thompson has barely a page out of a book of six hundred pages, the bare page that is accorded to almost anybody—to Caroline Clive. The mention of these two names of ladies, selected at random, carries with it no grudging of the space accorded to them—it merely illustrates the denial of any adequate treatment to their greater fellows. No plan or plea to explain this disproportion is adventured. We are left to surmise uncomfortably that sectarian prejudice, however subconscious, can alone account for it. Everywhere is room and to spare for biographies of far inferior men who do not happen to be Catholics. We are informed in what Irish town, and by whom (no resident, of course), James Thomson was converted to atheism; and how subsequently "he cast in his lot with a small but intrepid band of Free-thinking journalists." We have the tribute to "the childlike frankness of Swinburne's denunciation of kings and priests"—the childish denunciation of which, in his maturity, he made himself exaggeratedly Victor Hugo's sounding-board. There is page upon page in which to soften Samuel Butler's "Voltairean subversiveness," and to explain away his "plea against the Puritanic modesty

English Literature

which isolates and condemns the individual without consideration, etc.,” one need not fill in all the wordy *contours* of the ninepin that the anti-Christian sets up, labels Christian, and then successfully knocks over. But we get no answering detail, in fact or fancy, about authors of another calibre and another creed. We are not told that Francis Thompson, a Titan beside the James of his name, joined the band of Catholic (but of course never “intrepid”) journalists; and again, as a set off against the conversion by Bradlaugh of the author of *The City of Dreadful Night*, we might surely have asked for some mention of that interview in Rome in which a Jesuit told the author of *The Angel in the House* that his love-linking of earth and heaven was not merely Catholic—was Catholicism. “After changes of family, faith, and circumstance, Patmore produced a book of odes, entitled *The Unknown Eros*.” That is Mr. Saintsbury’s bleak allusion to Patmore’s conversion. True, if you are alert, you will have a clue to the goal achieved by Patmore. For you will be told that in “a recent and comparatively accidental coterie, admiration has occasionally rated him too high.” This “coterie” among Catholics would seem to obsess Mr. Saintsbury.

Thus, again, of Francis Thompson, he says: “During the latter years of his life he was taken up, both in person and in reputation, by benevolent persons in a powerful coterie.” If this means anything it means that Thompson had some adventitious aid in the making of his fame, that somewhere round about the poor human scene on which he played his solitary, and, while he lived, hardly regarded, part, he had the doubtful advantage of a *claque*. The suggestion is as ungenerous as it is false. Thompson was the only entirely friendless poet known to the last generation in his appearing. Tennyson had the Cambridge Apostolate, their drawn pens, ready to spring into praising print. Rossetti’s open allusions in his letters to “arrangements” for reviews of his forthcoming poems might be blushed over if you did not know how sensitive was the poet to the reception of these very children of his,

Some Recent Books

how insensitive the unprepared reviewer about an unfamiliar brood. But Thompson faced the ordeal alone. Not one single person supported him, even with private sympathy, until he dropped his first verses into the letter-box of a magazine. Thenceforward he had friends, one, two, or three, that only his poems made for him, friends who had neither the will nor the "power" to impose their judgment upon others. In due course Francis Thompson's volumes appeared. They had their reviewers, good, bad, indifferent, not one of whom had been "arranged" with, and not more than two of whom had ever met the poet.

How, then, can this resulting independent company be called a "coterie" without an abuse of the meaning of words? The first important voice, we remember, was that of Mr. H. D. Traill, a North of Ireland Protestant, who, in *The Nineteenth Century*, welcomed in Thompson "a new poet of the first rank." Mr. Le Gallienne and Mr. Arthur Symons had no religious experiences in common with this newcomer, of whom, nevertheless, the one said he was "Crashaw born again, but born greater," and the other that "No one else has been a torch waved with so fitful a splendour over the gulfs of our darkness." What fourth to such a "coterie" was the Bishop of London, when he called *The Hound of Heaven* "one of the most tremendous poems ever written," and what fifth Mr. Garvin, when he said of that poem that it was "the return of the Nineteenth Century to Thomas à Kempis"? Mr. Chesterton's "He was a great poet"; Mr. William Archer's "It is no minor Caroline singer he recalls, but the Jacobean Shakespeare"; George Meredith's "A true poet, one of the small band"; John Davidson's opinion that Thompson's "poetry at its highest attains a sublimity unsurpassed by any other Victorian poet"; the prophecy of George Wyndham that Thompson's poems and his prose would be held by posterity as the finest in all English literature during a fruitful two decades of years; "the revelation" that came to Sir A. Quiller Couch with "the Mistress of

English Literature

Vision"; and Sir Edward Burne-Jones's "cheered and comforted" winter when, in 1893, the first *Poems* appeared—these representative names come to mind to repel, each one of them, the idlest gossip about non-existent wire-pulling that ever got into a volume issued gravely under educational auspices.

The psychology of the myth, we take it, is obvious. That a deeply religious poet, a Christian, and a Catholic at that, should become one of the most understood and most read poets of his generation by all classes of lovers of literature, was a puzzle outside the experience of a certain make of mind. Something insidious, it conceived, must surely be at work. The "coterie" must be invented—the coterie that included Atheist, Hedonist, Pagan, Agnostic, Catholic, Anglican, Dissenter. Let Coventry Patmore, Thompson's most competent and therefore most exacting critic, be added to emphasize the catholicity of the list, unless indeed it be seriously maintained, by a Protestant "coterie" indeed, that a Catholic critic must put down his pen when a Catholic writer comes under review. And, as a footnote to this folly about a "coterie," let us track this austere Thompson into unlikeliest haunts. Mr. Saintsbury should have gone just once to the City Temple, under Mr. Campbell, when it was thronged to hear and to applaud readings from Thompson, one poem after another being demanded by name by the audience. For just once, too, he should read *The Christian Commonwealth*, which has just printed a lecture on *The Hound of Heaven*, given in the United States by this same City Temple's minister-elect. And should Mr. Saintsbury walk westward from Holborn Viaduct till he comes to the Bloomsbury Chapel, he will find there again, in its minister, a student of Thompson enthusiastic and profound. If a preposterous indictment entails on us a meticulousness in reply altogether unwelcome, the fault is not ours. Mr. Saintsbury must surely let his use of the word "coterie" pass into the frank company of his older Reconsiderations; or, if continued in use, its new meaning (we cannot imagine

Some Recent Books

the wording of it) must be considered the exclusive copyright of the Cambridge *History*.

The indifference of Mr. Saintsbury concerning great literature with Catholic tradition and love and service at its roots extends also to his mere statement of facts. If he failed in his intuition, he might at least have succeeded in his information. But it was not worth his while. So we get the authorship of the biography of Francis Thompson wrongly assigned. That is in the Thompson Bibliography, which begins with *New Poems*, and does not include the volume of *Selections* to which the student would naturally turn for his introduction to a strange and prolific poet. In a "Table of Principal Dates" (the date of Ouida's *Chandos* one of them!) Francis Thompson's *Poems* and his *Sister Songs* are lacking, as they are also in the Bibliography. *The Hound of Heaven* is his only entry among the "principal dates," and there the date of its publication, which meant so much to so many, is that of a reprint some twenty years after the time of the poem's first appearing. There is no mention of Thompson the master of metre in Mr. Saintsbury's essay on Prosody; and about Thompson's essay on Shelley, Mr. Saintsbury is dumb.

And this same indifference to ascertainable facts vitiates Mr. Saintsbury's allusions—hardly more—to other Catholic writers. Gladstone said of Manning, when Manning became a Catholic, that it was more than an estrangement, it was a "death." Only on this same reckoning of extinction can Mrs. Hamilton King (the names are not hyphenated as Mr. Saintsbury supposes, with a consequent confusion of indexing) be included in this volume, which does not otherwise deal with the living; and the slighting account of her work is all in keeping with its writer's ignorance of her existence. Revealingly characteristic is his allusion to Adelaide Anne Procter: "Very recently an Austrian monograph on her, though it was possibly prompted by the zeal of religious sympathy (she joined the Roman Catholic Church rather late in her short life) may have startled some of its readers who

English Literature

remembered her work as 'a book that used to belong to a fellow's sisters.' " Busy indeed will be the apostolic Austrian publisher who brings out all English poets who happen to be Catholics. Nor are we "startled" when we recall that even Austrians have sisters, and books to please them. Aubrey de Vere again is accorded space and appreciation inadequately out of scale. At least two of his odes rank second only to the very best. And here we have Mr. Saintsbury's same creed-consciousness expressed in the statement that De Vere's accession to the Catholic Church is one of those circumstances in which "there may be something to attract, and should be nothing at all to repel, the true critical approach." With which superfluity Mr. Saintsbury seems already to seek to defend himself in a formula which his practice violently sets at naught.

This limitation of outlook (and in one direction mainly) has further and even farcical illustration. Among the "Lesser Poets," where we are introduced to W. M. Wilks Call and Thomas Toke Lynch (the weird list might be prolonged), Lionel Johnson has not even a mention. His poetry is ignored, and with it that fine critical work which placed high poetry (that of Francis Thompson among the rest) within the range of the readers of a London morning paper. And when we turn to the General Index for a name not strange to Cambridge, we find the only Benson on it is "Thurston Benson" in Mrs. Gaskell's *Ruth*! Mr. Saintsbury may well be unaware of the verses of Robert Hugh Benson, but no well-informed reader will deny that he steps aside to take count of many verses, their inferiors. We note, too (though this is not in Mr. Saintsbury's province), that from the "Lesser Novelists" chapter, so generous otherwise in its general recognitions, Benson (like John Oliver Hobbes) is among the missing.

In all this how much, can we decide, is Mr. Saintsbury to blame? We will not risk the possible injustice of an estimate. We remember him on Milton, and on much besides; and the memory puts us again on terms with Mr. Saintsbury. In the far 'sixties of the last century,

Some Recent Books

when he still had the receptivity which age takes from man in forfeit for much that it confers, he could still dream with Gerontius. But even here ill-luck harries the *Cambridge History*, for Newman's poem is, by someone to whom its whole purport and setting must be unfamiliar, entered on page 576 as *The Dream of SAINT Gerontius*. Mr. Saintsbury is no dunce, yet no living literary critic (save perhaps one) could be so dense as he in his estimate of the literary quality that marks the latest Christian Renaissance in England. We could not call him a charlatan, but his pretence to know and to judge the work of Patmore and Thompson is nothing less than charlatanism. We challenge him to a competitive examination in the purport and the significance, and even in the technique, of Thompson's poetry with almost any one of the tens of thousands of young lovers of literature to whom this poet, in all varieties of his moods, has given a voice. We are certain that Mr. Saintsbury will gravitate to the lowest class-place. His shortcomings should have saved him from this display of them. They are doubtless constitutional as was Pepys' estimate of the mighty poor plays of Shakespeare or as was Shelley's strange incapacity to appreciate the Odes of Keats. But, in the case of others whom he treats, Mr. Saintsbury the critic gives place to Mr. Saintsbury the recorder. He tells us how many editions this man had, and even how a nameless critic once read a woman's verses in a second-hand bookshop and went home their possessor! It was his bare duty then, and Thompson's bare due, that he should tell us of the tributes, almost unparalleled in literary history, paid to Thompson by his contemporaries, now countersigned with high interest by the young succeeding generation. And we hold that he had misgivings, perhaps subconscious, that he should indeed do this for Thompson that he had done for others. And he did not do it. And to cover himself he invented the word "coterie," which, with the facts before him, no ingenuous man might use.

At the lapses of the individual critic, Literature can

English Literature

allow itself to laugh. But the case is far other when high Academic names become the passports, or even merely the palliations, of such defects as those we have exposed. Of the failure of the Editors in the choice of a judicious writer we need say no more. We can well appreciate their difficulties, but we make our confident appeal to them now to cease by some Postscript to be accessory to the circulation of errors in judgment and in fact. That Crashaw's University (and his Peterhouse even), that Cowley's and Donne's and Herbert's, should do this despite to the latest poet who proved himself at once their son and disciple and master, is one of those paradoxes against which we fortify ourselves only by remembering that in all our worlds there is advance by catastrophe as well as by evolution. For the moment this anomaly remains—that Thompson, coming to the Cambridge of the poets we have named, came in a sense unto his own, and that his own, and only his own, received him not.

READERS interested in philosophy will already know the *traité élémentaire* in which Cardinal Mercier and his old colleagues at Louvain gave a short summary of the chief philosophic disciplines. The first volume of the English version has recently appeared under the title, *A Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy*, translated by T. L. Parker, M.A., and S. A. Parker, O.S.B., M.A. (Kegan Paul). It contains an energetic introduction by Cardinal Mercier himself, to whom also we owe the sections on Psychology, Criteriology and Metaphysics. The Cosmology—the only remaining part of this volume—is the work of M. Nys. It is unfortunate that the translators did not arrange with him to re-write much of his Cosmology, and with the Cardinal to add at least adequate bibliographies to his Psychology. We find reference, in the translator's footnotes to the Psychology, to works like W. G. Ward's *Philosophy of Theism*—interesting, perhaps, on freedom of the will—and Abbot Vonier's *Human Soul*, which is a popular little handbook of Catholic Theology. We hear nothing of Dr. Myer's *Text-book*

Some Recent Books

of *Experimental Psychology*, nor of Titchener's volumes, to mention only two of the chief English works. But there is even less excuse for the omission of Wundt and Külpe, whose works have long since been translated into English. In fact one misses a hundred references to works, reviews, journals and monographs which ought to find a place in a student's handbook. The English of the translation is sometimes dignified and apt, sometimes rather wide of the mark, and often cumbersome. Scholastic philosophy is so highly technical and its formulæ so alien to the spirit of our language that a satisfactory account of it can scarcely be given in a translation. It would be better to restate with a certain freedom in terms, phrase, and expression, than to translate; better still to give us the ancient thought of the Greeks and Mediæval men as it streams through the mind of a philosopher who thinks, speaks, and writes in English.

THE influence of ideas on politics and of German philosophy on the declaration and conduct of the present war is a theme of extraordinary interest and complexity. It is easy to dogmatize, to connect a significant idea with a salient fact, but more than difficult to justify the hasty link. In consequence, much of the recent work on German philosophy has been tainted by prejudice, and by a multiplicity of assumptions. We would, however, indicate a very outspoken work on this subject, entitled *Egotism in German Philosophy*, by Professor G. Santayana, late of Harvard University (Dent), which is worthy of every consideration and much reflection. The learned Professor, who is also a poet, always felt during the twenty years of his Professorship, that "something sinister," something at once hollow and aggressive, was at work under the "obscure and fluctuating tenets" of German philosophy. And in this work, in which outspokenness and a desire to be just rival one another, he sets out his thesis that "egotism—subjectivity in thought and wilfulness in morals—is the soul of German philosophy." The whole is profoundly interesting. Some of

Egotism in German Philosophy

the ideas are subtle, light and fugitive ; others are deep as the ultimate basis of all things ; in any case the author's challenging thesis rings out on every page and arrests our attention at every turn, in spite of a hundred historical allusions. "Protestantism was not a reformation by accident, because it happened to find the Church corrupt ; it is a reformation essentially, in that every individual must reinterpret the Bible and the practices of the Church in his own spirit . . . German philosophy has inherited this characteristic ; it is not a cumulative science that can be transmitted ready-made. It is essentially a reform, a revision of traditional knowledge, which each neophyte must make for himself. . . . His chief business is to be converted ; he must refute for himself the natural views with which he and all other men have begun life. . . . This philosophy is secondary, critical, sophistical ; it has a perennial quarrel with inevitable opinions." And so this wild doctrine of absolute imagination and absolute will is traced now in the poets, now in the great philosophers Leibniz, Kant, and Hegel, and again in the late prophets like Nietzsche. We can only give one further extract : "The transcendental theory of a world merely imagined by the ego, and the will that deems itself absolute are certainly desperate delusions. . . . The thing bears all the marks of a new religion. . . . No religious tyranny could be more complete. It has its prophets in the great philosophers and historians of the last century ; its high priests and pharisees in the government and the professors ; its faithful flock in the disciplined mass of the nation ; its heretics in the Socialists ; its dupes in the Catholics and the Liberals, to both of whom the national creed, if they understood it, would be an abomination ; it has its martyrs now by the million ; and its victims among unbelievers are even more numerous ; for its victims, in some degree, are all men." Professor Santayana's work may be warmly commended for its insight, originality and undoubted power. Where we do not agree, we are refreshingly challenged to verify our objections.

Some Recent Books

SIR BAMPFYLDE FULLER has given his work, *Man as He is* (John Murray), the sub-title *Essays in a New Psychology*. Indeed, his psychology is in many ways "new," and seems to be the result of much private thought and observation on the part of its author. He has not bothered to consult other psychologists, and he thinks that they ignore human impulses. He then turns and asks: "Why should not the action of these impulses—as real as any physical energies—be investigated?" Why not, indeed? Sir Bampfylde will, however, be glad to hear that whole literatures and libraries of psychological, medical-psychological and psychiatric works exist on this very subject, and that no single aspect of his problem is new. Only his conclusions and his definitions are rather startling. The author sets before us the picture of human beings as creatures of memory and impulse. Somehow these two phenomena strike him so forcibly that nearly all the rest of our activities, conscious, subconscious, and unconscious, are almost forgotten. We find ourselves being projected from a short and unsatisfactory consideration of one impulse to that of another, until we reach the "impulses of memory." On this Sir Bampfylde has much of interest to say, but it is all very "literary," not very exact, and miles removed from all the recent experimental studies of memory, souvenir, and recollection. Moreover, he forgets the existence of a *mémoire logique* in his hurry to give some account of impulses, hereditary instincts, and associations of sensory impressions. "Civilization," he declares, at the close of this chapter, "may be defined as the elaboration of recollections by the assistance of tools or machines under the pressure of desires." Would art fall within this "definition," or the study of philosophy, the practice of religion, or that natural desire for the organization and extension of knowledge in science which goes with all real civilization? All these would be excluded. Elsewhere we read "We have discriminated between impulses and emotions, defining the latter as impulses which are brought to consciousness by the admixture of the element 'feeling.'" Frankly, if interesting,

False Witness

this is very amateur psychology, and the same remarks apply to a very categorical series of reflections under the heading of "intelligence." "Truth is a piece of recollection which fills the vacant space in a problem puzzle"—such remarks only leave us gasping, or rather almost induce us, in a lighter mood, to attempt a few parallels. "Man's extraordinary pre-eminence" over the animals, our author concludes, is due "to excellences of memory." "We customarily pride ourselves upon our intelligence. But confidence in this talent is shaken by a series of the gross misjudgments . . . superstitions, and prejudices, which have darkened man's history from the earliest beginnings until present times." We would suggest that Sir Bampfylde should re-read once more the sixth book of Plato's *Republic*—in which memory is noted as *one* of the qualities of a philosopher. But there are others; and men still stand out as the "consummation of the scheme of being" on account of their strange power of conceiving, judging, reasoning, and then of following the trail of rational judgment in conduct of their own choice. Memory is indeed wonderful; but, in a world of unfailing wonders, intellect, which is not a refinement of sensation, and will, which is not a development of impulse, stand out radiantly supreme.

IT is rare that a poet comes convincingly to our rescue. Poets mostly forget to mention the facts from which they leap to their visionary skies. But the famous Dane, Johannes Jørgensen, in *False Witness* (Hodder and Stoughton), has marshalled facts as severely as might any professional statistician, and prefaces them and comments on them with all the grace and more than the biting irony which were to be expected from the Danish convert who has become for all Europe the chronicler of Franciscans. He fled the war, to start with, and went to write, behind closed shutters, in the serene city of St. Catherine. Thither floated to him the *Appeal to the Civilized World* by the ninety-three German philosophers. The poet thought it an advertisement, and tossed it into his waste-

Some Recent Books

paper basket. He fished it out again, however ; and this book is a close examination of the six-fold charge of False Witness brought by its learned authors against the accusing Allies. It is terribly hard for us to keep the war in focus ; it has, more than once, changed character so markedly, and once so completely, that the emotions of the summer and autumn of 1914 seem not to be recaptured, almost incredible. Yet the days were when Louvain filled all our vista. It is to those days that this "Appeal" belonged ; it is those emotions which Mr. Jørgensen recalls to actuality. His work, then, is of the highest value : we simply must not dare to allow the memory of the period of "atrocities" to fade. The issue, we repeat, is a psychological and spiritual one ; and though, in 1917, the strain proper to trench warfare fashions our mood, it only *happens* to be so, and the ultimate German soul is still capable of expressing itself now as it did then ; or, if indeed it be not, that is only due to the intensity of the Allied rejection of its ideals, which must not, therefore, be for a moment slackened.

FOR Catholics, Mr. R. Johannet's *Pan-Germanism versus Christendom* (Hodder & Stoughton), has perhaps a paramount, and anyhow a most melancholy, interest. Its nucleus is the open letter written by M. Prüm to Herr Erzberger. The leader of the Catholic party in Luxembourg, prominent in every Catholic enterprise, and honoured with many interviews and decorations by two Pontiffs, M. Prüm was at the outset anti-French, when to be Gallophil could be equated with anti-clericalism, and on the whole pro-German. The spectacle of invaded Belgium converted him. The utterances of the German Press, and in particular of the Catholic Press, the attitude of the Centre Party, and especially of Herr Erzberger, terrified his profoundly Christian principles. It was not difficult for him to set the ideals of Pope Benedict and of Erzberger in flagrant opposition. This letter, and the slander-suit consequent upon it, form, as we said, the substance of this book. But it is the Appendix upon the

Stars and Fishes—Pilgrimage

de-catholicizing of the German Centre Party that we read with mingled grief and, dare we say, satisfaction. After all, then, the utterances of that Party which we had been, most of us, accustomed to think of as essentially and eminently Catholic, did *not* proceed from what was Catholic any more. But that this *de-catholicizing* should have taken place at all is the heart-breaking fact. Had it not taken place, could the names of men still *soi disant* Catholics be found among the preachers of a nationalism nothing less than insane?

MR. GEORGE ROSTREVOR'S two stanzas on "England," in his *Stars and Fishes* (The Bodley Head), have a true, grave splendour. All these short war-poems are sensitive and reticent. He sings much of love, but he can laugh; and his laugh is neither lewd nor boisterous. And with laughter and love he can link worship, as his "philosophy," *St. Cupid*, proves. He can tread delicately, like Herrick; yet is aware of the strength which pain can bring. The companion poems, *Before the Cradle* and *Before the Cross*, have something of his voice who sang the thorn-and-laurel crown, and Francis Thompson confessedly inspires *The Unattainable*, in which the soul, having drunk deep of the Divine, finds earth grown arid. Yet not, by the Catholic, were his wanderings there felt as "unprofitable"! So true is it that faith makes the wilderness to blossom better than the rose.

MR. E. SHEPHERD'S poems, *Pilgrimage* (Longmans), are musical, clean-cut, and constantly better than we expected. This is due, perhaps, to his undoubted use of platitude; but platitude, personally discovered, often breeds freshness of expression. Indeed, it is freshness, rather than strength, which lends charm to his verses. Has his experience been born of pain? His *Happy Saint* makes us doubt it. That kind of easy cheerfulness is almost protestant in taste. All saints need grim lessoning. Nervous fastidiousness, therefore, a thin substitute for full-blooded experience, accounts perhaps for what is

Some Recent Books

quite weak in his work (as for what is academically burly and bluff), like *Machinery*, or *The Military Hospital*; but anyone who can write, say, *Marjorie*, or *To a Lad* (which is throughout first-rate) shows a sense of humour and music, and an honesty which will win him a high place.

A VERY self-conscious music certainly gives distinction to Mr. T. W. H. Crosland's *Collected Poems* (Martin Secker); but neither here has it the rich pomposity of, say, Wagner's Meistersingers, who strut so gloriously to *motifs* full of the kindest mockery. So much of this careful, complicated, "artistic" and reticent verse makes one remember that its authors are probably writing it clad in most quiet, admirable tailoring, intent on looking as little like a poet as a modern peer wants to look like a Baron. In consequence, when this writer is roused, and waxes patriotic, we half question it. *A Song of Pride for England* on the whole even exasperates us. "King George in London Town, Swearth our own's our own," and so on. It somehow fails; we haven't got men just now who could write a Drayton's *Agincourt*. Mr. Crosland's *Chant of Affection* is the wrong answer, essentially, to the Hate-hymn. But the moment simplicity and honesty appear, we answer up. These are discernible in *John Bunyan, Christmas, In the Train*, and not least in the sad little *Epitaph*. The Sonnet, itself the most courteous among forms of verse, must be sore against Mr. Crosland's "Suffragette" lines—it never thought it could be brought so low. Though only mean minds (says Mr. Lucas) remark misprints, let us add that it is odd that twice in this short book *thy* is misprinted *they*.

MR. J. C. SQUIRE says that his *Tricks of the Trade* (Martin Secker) contains his "final essays" in the "not wholly admirable art" of parody; but there! goodbye concerts bear repetition well; and on the whole, we can't believe it. All that he writes is utterly schoolboy for spontaneity, and it's no good dictating to the spontaneous; it just happens, and that's all there is to it. And

Hallowe'en and Poems of War

then, "essays." We don't believe Mr. Squire has to try a bit. Possibly that half spoils part of this book as "parody." The first, on Mr. Belloc, is good parody; but the second was produced during sheer reincarnation. On the whole, this first part, "How they do it," seems more successful than the second, "How they would have done it," where Wordsworth takes Masfield's subjects; Swinburne, Macaulay's; Pope, Tennyson's; and Henry James rewrites the *Catechism*. For complete success here we ought to have had a more definite reminiscence of some analogous work by the poet who shows us how he "would have written" on these borrowed topics, rather as when Beckmesser sings the *Preislied*—anyhow, you want a double reminiscence of subject, not merely a simple allusion *plus* a parody of style. Perhaps you get this in Byron's *Passing of Arthur*. Of course, the old question as to sacrilege repeats itself.

Ought the uncannily clever new Gray's *Elegy* to have appeared? Gray was sentimental, and, thus far, fair game. But he was terrifically honest. On the other hand, Sir Rabindranath Tagore is—or his worshippers, at any rate, are—so very cultured, that we suppose a little mockery is wholesome. Still, it is a dangerous remedy; and it is most important that heathen should have idols. Don't destroy without a better than equivalent in hand. Still, if you want a frequent laugh and (for this is what this book more exactly earns) a continuous half-hour's giggle, Mr. Squire offers you a certainty.

MISS W. M. LETTS holds us with *Hallowe'en and Poems of the War* (Smith, Elder). She is Irish, which accounts for much. Is she Catholic? We are not sure; but she ought to be, for the root of the thing is in her. Wistful and courageous; very free and flexible in expression, yet never outrageous nor affected; realist and objective, yet full of never sentimental sentiment; sympathetic with legend, fancy and mystic intuition, she is yet never victim to that spirit of "fake" which spoils so much neo-Irish literature. We like to find hospital

Some Recent Books

nurses hymned ; and the tragic hospital screens ; and unknown John Delaney, and that Gethsemane which chaplains know. We delight in, and would wish to quote, all *Angelic Service*, in which last, perhaps, you may see its authoress's crisp humour and spiritual sense. And she loves all the honest flowers—nasturtiums not least ; angels go dressed in larkspur-blue, and Our Lady in lupin colours. And though there are here and there, perhaps, technical flaws and lapses, she preserves a quiet strength of feeling, as in the wonderful poem *Home*, which carries you across them. We confess to having drawn courage from this book, and shall now re-read it, at this midnight.

POETRY has always loved the general landscape ; but it is modern poetry especially that delights in the local. Among the poems in Father E. G. Rope's *Religionis Ancilla* (Heath, Cranton) we find the keenly English sense of places, and before all of Italian places, and it is expressed in verse of uncommon charm. *A Latin Pilgrimage*, *The Roman Campagna*, among other pieces, are alert in the perception of church-bells and sheep-bells, and stone villages clinging to the stone of Sabine hills, and the sparkle of distant panes turned to the West, and the vestiges of vanished nations that had once withstood Rome, and the creaking of the wine-carts, and cypresses in steps up the scarped hills. We are loth to accept *North and South* as a recantation, but it comes near to it. Father Rope has a right to his love of the "good grey northland" also, but it is to Italy that he owes his most delicate and most vivid stanzas. Whatever his landscapes, his poems are implicitly religious, fervent, and spiritual.

"THIS, then, is the problem of life as it presents itself when we address ourselves to the theory of the organism : Is the soul a mere aggregate symptom of a mechanism—the body ? Or is the body not rather the instrument of the soul ? (The MS. breaks off at this point.)" Such are the final words of what one feels to

An Introduction to Biology

be a noble fragment, *An Introduction to Biology* (Cassell), by A. D. Darbishire, untimely dead in this devastating war. A well-known biological teacher, he entered the army as a private, saw much service, and was actually gazetted Second-Lieutenant three days after his death from meningitis. Thus the question which he proposes in the last lines just quoted can never receive the answer he was about to offer. But no reader of the earlier pages can for a moment doubt what that answer would have been. Darbishire had a singularly wide outlook. Apart from his biological interests (in which he was much affected by Samuel Butler's writings) he was a close student of the philosophy of Bergson. Beyond all other things he was a musical devotee; Beethoven was his musical deity, and it is characteristic that he should have set down in his note-book a sort of Beethoven symphony as the plan for his book: "Chapter I, 1st Movement; Chapter II, *Scherzo*; Chapter III, *Adagio*; Chapter IV, *Finale*." Chapter III was the one left incomplete in the words quoted. Chapter IV was never written. The author of this book was one of the many modern biologists (a work by just such another, Mr. Johnston, was dealt with in our last number), whose intelligence revolts against the worn-out, discredited, mid-Victorian theory which represents all life as summed up by Chemistry and Physics. This stale old doctrine—now only adhered to by a few older men who, having grown up in it, find it impossible to discard the ideas of their youth—cannot stand against the facts brought forward by modern research, especially in that most fertile field of Experimental Embryology. For the fragment from which the book derives its name, readers will scarcely fail to note the significance of the phrase "*A Biology*." The remainder is occupied by short articles and addresses, many of them relating to the Mendelian inquiry. All are of interest, but perhaps more so to biological specialists than to the philosophically minded reader who will, however, find himself engrossed by the earlier portion of the book.

Some Recent Books

IN *The Monks of Westminster* (the Cambridge University Press), being a Register of the Brethren of the Convent from the time of the Confessor to the Dissolution, Archdeacon Pearce gives welcome evidence that something further is being done to make known the historical records of the Middle Ages too long neglected in many of the Cathedral and other archives. In itself it is a valuable historical source; and the same author's *Abbot William of Colchester* shows how useful is such matter for the biographers of the men who filled important places in England in the Middle Ages. The author's learned introduction to the *Register* shows how much may be recovered by minute and intelligent research from what seem to be the most unlikely materials, such as Compotus Rolls. The student of the antiquities of Westminster Abbey will be joined in his appreciation of the Archdeacon's labours by all interested in the details of mediæval monastic life. Similar *Notes and Documents* should be issued, say, in connection with Worcester Cathedral, where so much material awaits the gleaner.

WHATEVER be the military conclusion of the war, our win will have been wasted if the psychology of nations have not been changed. And, whatever be our sense of our own shortcomings, we are determined that we speak with no Pharisaic voice if we insist that no Allied victory will be worth having if the Germans be not "scattered in the imagination of their hearts." We do not see how this can happen save at the cost of their sanguinary defeat. Be that as it may, document after document reveals to us a state of mind our *naïveté* finds it hard to realize, which simply must be done away with. Perhaps already it has been ruined at the base. We do not know. Whether the sermons and the lectures to which the books about to be reviewed contain allusions be possible nowadays, we cannot guess. But the sheer insanity of self-apotheosis they reveal, the bombast unthinkable in the worst days of France, the cant unparalleled by anything English when England most thought herself

Hurrah and Hallelujah

the elect of God—these *have* existed ; and what we think still does exist is the *irreligionized* version of the almighty German race, the abdication, indeed, of all that Kultur which still might be translated “culture,” which is expressed in cartoon after cartoon of *Jugend*, say, and *Simplicissimus*, where naked brutality is advanced in a guise which reveals the worst of neurotic degradations. This undoubtedly survives, and is still more perfectly expressed in the cumbrous monument at Leipzig. And it is all that *mind* which must be altered. That this is gradually becoming understood, the following books reveal. We are too lazily tolerant of *ideas*. These Danes and Frenchmen see further, and are not content with mere registration, nor even ridicule, nor even contempt. They are terrified for the future, and attack these rotten stones which the frantic would-be builders of the German world-state are fain to use for their foundations.

FOR evidence of this outcry of non-Catholic pastor and professor, no book can be more valuable than Jessie Bröchner's translation of *Hurrah and Hallelujah*, by Dr. J. P. Bang, Professor of Theology at the University of Copenhagen (Hodder & Stoughton). If only it were but a caricature, the book would simply be funny beyond words. *Punch's* skits contain nothing as fantastic as these sermons on “The German God” ; these equations of Seraphim with Zeppelins ; these discoveries that “there is nothing in Jesus which is not German.” But that Catholics should be among these maniacs—should be so mad, or so little Catholic ! There, indeed, is a problem for after-war decision. Can there be reconversion ? Will there be schism ? God forbid that one word should be written by English Catholics to hinder the one or provoke the other. This inquiry, however, should be zealously carried through by those who are capable of it. How much of that anti-clericalism, which we used to call French, had not Germany for its richest source ? The fact of *war* has been offered again and again as cause of the re-christianizing of France. We ask to-day whether

Some Recent Books

it be not precisely the fact that it is an *anti-German* war, which has done most to make it so responsible. The books of Mme Juliette Adam, too little known in England, suggest directly—and from a period preceding her conversion—that it is so.

IN “La Messe de la terre and la Messe du ciel”—a paper printed in the *Revue Pratique d'Apologétique*—Père Jules Grivet, S.J., puts forth some decidedly individual views on the Sacrifice of the Mass and on the idea of sacrifice in general. He criticizes severely various accepted theories on the subject, maintaining that they are based on a too narrow definition of sacrifice. Père Grivet himself denies that immolation or blood-shedding, or any kind of destruction or even change, is an essential element of sacrifice. Any act of religion, whatever its external form, he would raise to the rank of a sacrifice; and even any action performed from religious motives he brings within the comfortable fold of his definition. In support, he quotes the famous words of St. Augustine, in the *De Civitate Dei*: “Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agimus ut sancta societate inhæreamus Deo” (*L.X.*, c. 6).

Père Grivet momentarily forgets, however, the equally familiar words of St. Augustine in the same work: “Multa denique de cultu divino usurpata sunt quæ honoribus deferrentur humanis sive humilitate nimia, sive adulatione pestifera . . . quis Vero Sacrificandum Censuit, nisi ei quem Deum aut scivit aut putavit, aut fuixit?” (*ib.* c. 4). St. Thomas, disciple of St. Augustine, Père Grivet also quotes in support, seemingly forgetting *secunda secundæ* (*Q.*, lxxxv. a. 3), in which the Saint treats the question of sacrifice *ex professo*, and distinguishes between acts of the virtue of religion and acts of other virtues, as also between sacrifice properly so-called and other acts of worship—for example, simple oblations offered to God. It is all a continual confusion between the strict and the wide sense of the word sacrifice. Widely, any act of religion, or any that is inspired by

Sacrifice of the Mass

religious motives, may be called (as St. Thomas says) a true sacrifice. Thus it is quite legitimate to speak of prayer as "the sacrifice of praise." Again, an act of penance or self-denial, or an act of charity—an act, that is, performed from a motive of charity in the theological sense—may be regarded as a true sacrifice offered to God. In c. 5 of the *De Civitate Dei*, St. Augustine defines sacrifice in the strict sense in these words: "Sacrificium visibile invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum est." Père Grivet has in mind merely the "invisible sacrifice," the inward part, which, while certainly the most important part, is nevertheless only a part of the whole. His views on the sacrifice of the Cross and of the Mass are in keeping with his views on sacrifice in general. Our Saviour, he says, is our Victim, not because of the Cross itself, but because He is our triple means of union with God; through Him we obtain pardon for sins, grace to aid us to heaven; and we have in Him our final reward. Surely the terms are again astray. The English word "victim" and the French word "hostie"—derived respectively from the Latin words *victima* and *hostia*—signify a living creature offered in sacrifice by means of death and the shedding of blood. And even if it be granted that our Saviour still offers Himself in sacrifice in the heavenly sanctuary, could the mere presence on the altar of the Priest-Victim of that sacrifice suffice, as Père Grivet maintains, to constitute the Mass a true and proper sacrifice? If it did, then the Mass of the Presanctified celebrated on Good Friday is as truly a sacrifice as the Mass celebrated on any day of the year. Even the presence of the Blessed Sacrament in the tabernacle or when exposed in the monstrance would be, according to such reasoning, a true sacrifice. If the presence in the Mass is merely the representation of the death of our Lord upon the Cross, as a past event, then there is no essential difference between the Mass, the Good Friday service, reservation, or exposition. One point, however, Father Grivet does make unintentionally clear—that before any satisfactory

Some Recent Books

discussion, a precise notion must first be obtained of the right nature and the naming of sacrifice itself.

IF the reading of the *Sunday Observer* is a part of the Londoner's Sunday observance, he found in the issue of March 11th an editorial treatment of the Irish question well worthy of the man who wrote it, of the men of whom it was written, and, let us add, of the holyday: "Nationalists like Mr. John Redmond and his gallant brother deserve the gratitude of the Empire. They have been great patriots and great gentlemen. They have done their utmost for the Allies' cause in circumstances, first of infinite difficulty and then of almost heart-breaking trial. Throwing themselves heart and soul into the war at the beginning, their action was worth many battalions.... Mr. T. P. O'Connor, in a speech both able and moderate, proposed" (in the House of Commons on March 6th) "the immediate application of Home Rule. This was seconded by Major William Redmond—'that d'Artagnan of Irish Nationalism'—who came once more from the front, where he is serving at an age which might well exempt him from the toils of war. He is a man whom every Unionist honours more and more, and his appeal profoundly moved the House." Many readers will be again moved to admiration and gratitude by the article from Major Redmond's pen printed on another page.

R E C E N T PUBLICATIONS

¶ THE STATIONS OF THE CROSS. Taken freely from the Meditations on the Passion of Our Lord. By *Richard Rolle*, with cuts by *Gabriel Pippet*. 40 pp. Wrapper, 6d. net. Postage 1d.

¶ SAINTS OF THE EUCHARIST. By *Isabel Thornton*. With a Preface by Father *David Bearne*, S.J., and Illustrations by *F. Ffrench*. Cloth, 3s. net. Postage 4d.

¶ THE RELIGIOUS POETRY OF LIONEL JOHNSON: BEING A SELECTION FROM HIS COLLECTED WORKS. With a Preface by *Wilfrid Meynell*. 2s. 6d. net. Postage 3d.

¶ THE ONE HUNDRED AND FIVE MARTYRS OF TYBURN. By the *Nuns of Tyburn Convent*. With an Introduction by *Dom Bede Camm*, O.S.B. Illustrated. Wrapper, 1s. net. Postage 2d.

¶ THE CONGREGATION OF JESUS AND MARY: CAMEOS FROM ITS HISTORY. With a Foreword by Father *Sydney Smith*, S.J. Frontispiece portrait and eight illustrations. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net. Postage 4d.

BURNS AND OATES
28, ORCHARD STREET, LONDON, W. 1.

¶ **ANTICHRIST: AN HISTORICAL REVIEW.** By *James J. L. Ratton*, M.D., M.C., Q.U.I., Lieut.-Colonel I.M.S. (retired). Author of *The Apocalypse, the Antichrist, and the End*, etc. Illustrated. Demy 8vo. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net. Postage 5d.

¶ **THE MYSTICAL KNOWLEDGE OF GOD: AN ESSAY IN THE ART OF KNOWING AND LOVING THE DIVINE MAJESTY.** By *Dom Savinien Louismet*, O.S.B. F'cap 8vo. Cloth, gilt, with a Frontispiece in photogravure. 2s. 6d. net. Postage 3d.

THIS is a book for the priest on the mission, the ecclesiastical student, the cloistered contemplative and the apostolic man of the world. It makes its appeal also to the little ones of the flock, eager for instruction in "the art of knowing and loving God," and comforted and refreshed by any increase in their proficiency. In the sequence of the chapters is a gradation which at once allures the reader and uplifts him. He finds himself carried to the summit of Divine contemplation and Effusive Love, until the final chapter gives him the last word to be said on earth about God in the light of eternity.

A New Book by Mother Mary Loyola.

¶ **BLESSED ARE THEY THAT MOURN.** Edited with a Preface by Rev. *Herbert Thurston*, S.J., with Frontispiece "The Resurrection," after Fra Angelico. Crown 8vo. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net. Postage 3d.

It is *Mother Mary Loyola's* kindly purpose to offer her tribute of deepest and most respectful sympathy to the

BURNS AND OATES
28, ORCHARD STREET, LONDON, W. 1.

many wives, mothers, daughters, sisters, or betrothed whose cup of sorrow has been filled brim-full by the terrible happenings of the war. But she gives them more than barren sympathy, she provides substantial comfort as well as help to guide their thoughts heavenward to the one and only source of consolation.

Mother *Loyola's* touching volume is one which will bring balm to many a sorely stricken heart.—*From the Preface by Father Thurston.*

¶ DEVOTION TO THE HOLY FACE. By *E. Seton*. Boards, 2s. net. Postage 3d.

WIDELY practised on the Continent generally, and particularly in France, devotion to our Lord in reparation for the blasphemies against His Holy Face is less known amongst ourselves. Miss *Seton* has now written for English readers an account of the rise of the devotion in Tours sixty years ago, and of its devotional fruits. An important feature of the book is that it gives an anthology of approved prayers, litanies, and other devotions. It should find many readers.

¶ LITTLE PILGRIMS TO OUR LADY OF LOURDES. By Mrs. *Francis Blundell* (M. E. Francis). Crown 8vo. 3s. 6d. net. Postage 3d.

MRS. *Blundell* has achieved a brilliant literary success in her labour of love.—*Universe.*

THE narrative is done with loving care and exquisite skill, and is one of the best books about Lourdes with which we are acquainted.—*Freeman's Journal.*

BURNS AND OATES
28, ORCHARD STREET, LONDON, W. 1.

¶ CHRIST THE CONSOLER: A PRAYER BOOK FOR THOSE BEREAVED BY THE WAR. Compiled by *Agnes Egerton Castle*. Printed in red and black, limp lambskin, silk marker. 3s. net. Postage 2d. Also in limp morocco, gilt edges, 6s. net.

¶ A LITTLE BOOK OF PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD. Compiled from Liturgical sources. By *W. H. Kent*, O.S.C. Uniform with the above. Printed in red and black, limp lambskin, silk marker, 3s. net. Postage 2d. Also in limp morocco, gilt edges, 6s. net.

¶ FROM THE SEPULCHRE TO THE THRONE. By *Madame Cecilia* (of St. Andrew's Convent, Streatham). 426 pages. Bound in art canvas, gilt, with six plates, in lithographic offset. 6s. net. Postage 5d.

¶ VERSES IN PEACE AND WAR. By *Shane Leslie*. Cloth, gilt, with a portrait in photo-gravure. 2s. 6d. net. Postage 3d.

THOSE many watchers after new talent who have found much to interest them in the personality and prose of Mr. *Shane Leslie* will welcome this little collection of his poems. Their quality, indeed, is not altogether unknown, for he was one of the contributors to "Eyes of Youth," that assembly of poems by a little group of Catholic friends which found much favour and many purchasers a few years ago. *The Athenæum* then wrote: "The note of individuality and enterprise makes itself heard in the varied output of Mr. *Shane Leslie*. He adds strength to versatility. His short poem 'The Bee' shows the instinct of the born lyricist."

BURNS AND OATES

28, ORCHARD STREET, LONDON, W. 1.

THE HISTORY OF THE EMPIRE OF THE A

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

THE HISTORY OF THE
EMPIRE OF THE

